

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12191) to provide for free carriage of first-class mail matter to and from persons in the Army and Navy of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12192) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12193) to punish and fix the penalty for high crimes, offenses, and misdemeanors against the welfare, safety, and dignity of the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 12194) to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PLATT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 293) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 353) for the consideration of H. R. 12099; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 354) for the consideration of H. R. 12100; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 12195) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 12196) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 12197) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Scherr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 12198) granting an increase of pension to William P. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 12199) granting a pension to Mary J. McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12200) granting an increase of pension to John Coss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 12201) granting a pension to Lucy A. Gardner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12202) granting an increase of pension to David Hofer, alias John Burkhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12203) granting a pension to Loretah B. Farlee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12204) granting a pension to Kate A. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 12205) granting a pension to Mary E. Beall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 12206) granting a pension to David Evans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12207) for the relief of James F. Ayers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12208) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution of the churches of Plymouth Rock Association, pledging loyalty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of W. M. Duff and 37 others, all of Denver, Colo., urging prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of the Presbyterian Church of Northville, Mich., in favor of repeal of postal zone system of second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Ladies' Round Table Club, of Pontiac, Mich., in favor of repeal of postal zone system of second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition of residents of Beltrami County, Minn., favoring fixing the prices of wheat substitutes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the Hartford (Conn.) Clearing House Association, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 4426; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Rev. J. M. Sundheim, president of the northern Minnesota district, the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, protesting against the enactment into law of House bill 5712; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, protesting against the proposed postal increases for publishers effective July 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of the El Paso County (Colo.) Retail Grocers' and Butchers' Association, asking that prices on wheat substitutes be fixed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 21, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bless Thee that in all the long and weary and tragic months through which we have come, as we have pressed forward in the performance of our high mission, we have had no question about the pureness of Thy motive, the unselfishness of our design, and the full and free committal of ourselves to the rights of men. We believe that Thou hast been leading us on. We pray that Thou wilt continue to lead us. Bless those who represent us on the bloody field of battle, and those who guide in the affairs of nations, and those who are delivering their strength of means and life to the great end of establishing peace and righteousness among men. Bless us this day in the performance of our duty. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore assumed the chair.

The Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, May 17, 1918, was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced his signature to the following enrolled bills which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 2123. An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia;

S. 4409. An act to amend section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes";

H. R. 8696. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919; and

H. R. 11628. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia," approved September 25, 1914.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, a few days ago I received and had read into the RECORD an editorial from a newspaper in a neighboring State to that of South Dakota relative to the subscriptions of the State for the third liberty loan. I now send to the desk a telegram with reference to the subscriptions to the second Red Cross war fund, which I ask may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SIoux FALLS, S. DAK., May 20, 1918.

Hon. THOMAS STERLING,
Washington, D. C.:
With every city, village, and township under perfect organization, drive for second Red Cross war fund was begun this morning at 8 o'clock in every community in South Dakota. At 6 o'clock to-night the State campaign is concluded with a subscription of 170 per cent of our allotment. Our home county (Minnehaha) wins the honor with more than 300 per cent subscription of its allotment. South Dakota is the first State to go over the top.

GEO. R. DOUTHITT,
Vice Chairman for South Dakota.

Mr. JONES, of Washington. Mr. President, I have resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., with reference to the zone system. I wish to read an extract from the letter of the secretary transmitting it:

You will notice that it is a protest against the zone system of postage as applied to periodicals. I want to say for your information that this action was not taken hastily by the chamber of commerce, but after the most careful consideration.

Then he names the committee who had charge of it. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I also present a resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Skamania County, State of Washington, urging the importance of the survey and the construction of national military roads as a matter of national preparedness. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I yesterday received a letter, which is signed by Ed Gammons, publicity director of the International Workers' Defense League, of San Francisco, Cal. This gentleman seems to think that I have recently done an injustice to an organization called the I. W. W. in some remarks I made upon the floor of the Senate concerning that association. I have no wish to do injustice to anyone, even to that organization, and therefore ask leave to print in the RECORD without reading the criticisms which this gentleman makes of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS' DEFENSE LEAGUE,
San Francisco, Cal., May 14.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I notice in my copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing the report of the discussion in the Senate on the punishment of unlawful associations' bill, that you stated that an I. W. W. organizer stated before the Federal commission appointed by President Wilson to investigate the Mooney case said that murder and destruction of property was justified. You further stated that he went before the commission to protest that Mooney had not been convicted according to the forms of the Constitution and the law.

You inadvertently have done us an injustice. The I. W. W. have never been identified with the Mooney case here. None of them appeared before the commission. The incident you referred to occurred in one of the sittings of the Commission on Industrial Relations, of which Mr. Frank P. Walsh was chairman. The organizer in question was Vincent St. John. You will find the portion of the evidence you referred to on page 1452 of the report of that commission. As you will see by our letterhead, the unions defending Mr. Mooney are all identified with the American Federation of Labor.

I hope you will correct this, as it is liable to prejudice other Congressmen against you who are unacquainted with the facts.

Respectfully,

ED GAMMONS, Publicity Director.

Mr. NUGENT. I send to the desk resolutions adopted by the Council of Defense of Shoshone County, Idaho, which I ask may be read and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas our country is engaged in a great war in which every ideal of government and social life we hold dear is threatened with destruction and our national life as the world's great Republic is at stake; and

Whereas the shortage of labor in shipyards and factories, mills and mines, forests and farms, is appalling; and

Whereas interned aliens are living in idleness at public expense and thousands of able-bodied Americans of all classes and conditions are spending their time aimlessly and without serious purpose; and

Whereas the vagrancy laws of the States generally are not sufficiently drastic to meet the crisis; and

Whereas the flower of our young men are being conscripted to endure the hardships of war and face death upon the battle fields of Europe in order that government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall not perish from the earth. Be it

Resolved by the Council of Defense of Shoshone County, State of Idaho, in regular session assembled:

First. That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to at once enact a uniform law, applicable to all the States, sufficiently comprehensible and drastic to control and perfect the labor situation; that all interned aliens be compelled to work and labor, under armed guard if necessary, in lumber camps, in mills and mines, and on farms, under such conditions as may be humane, receiving such wages as may be just.

Second. That in like manner it be enacted that our own idle people, rich and poor alike, be compelled to work at least five days weekly in some useful occupation, the results of which will help us win the war by adding to our stores of food and fuel, munitions of war, and supplies of every kind necessary for the well-being of our soldiers in trench or battle field, fighting in the air, or wherever duty calls; that this work may be done, and well done, in order that unlimited streams of our great abundance may steadily flow overseas to cheer and comfort and sustain our soldiers and the equally brave men and women of our magnificent Red Cross army; be it further

Resolved, That during the period of war all "red-light districts" in the United States be closed; that the inmates be interned in camps over the country; that under proper supervision and control they be employed in making clothing and other supplies for Army use and in producing anything that may be useful, permitting them to live under humane conditions and allowing them just compensation, at the same time protecting them from vicious influences; and in this connection

we suggest that if some such plan be adopted and executed not only will labor conditions be helped but the general health will be better protected and humanity uplifted, and after three, or even two, years, if the war lasts so long, it is more than probable that a large percentage of these unfortunate creatures will be fitted for and return to the decent life; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded at once to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and that they be requested to use their best endeavors to secure the desired congressional legislation.

Mr. OWEN presented a petition of Local Branch, National Woman's Party, of Tulsa, Okla., and a petition of sundry citizens of Tulsa, Okla., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I have been necessarily absent from the city for a week, and this morning I received in the mail a very important letter, which I desire to present as a petition and ask that it be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1918.

Senator BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TILLMAN: Instead of allowing the Susan B. Anthony suffrage amendment to be voted upon by the Senate last Friday, as they agreed, the advocates of this force bill submitted a table, cleverly designed to properly impress the Senate with the number of alleged suffrage "victories" scored in 1917.

This table was introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and is on page 6306. We sincerely hope that you will consider it carefully and observe the following facts:

1. There are 32 alleged "victories" listed.

2. Every one of them, with the single exception of New York, was a legislative victory.

3. The State of Ohio is credited with three of these "victories"—in the legislature—yet nothing whatever is said of the fact that the voters of Ohio by a majority of 146,120 defeated and repealed these "victories" on November 6.

4. The State of Maine is credited with two legislative victories, submitting suffrage to the voters, but not a word is said of the fact that the voters of Maine on September 10 defeated woman suffrage at the polls by 2 to 1.

5. The State of Indiana is credited for three of these alleged "victories"—in the legislature—but not a word is said of the fact that the Supreme Court of Indiana has declared these "victories" unconstitutional.

The table was prepared by the official suffrage organ and was introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the express purpose of influencing the United States Senate. It is a fair sample of the "purified politics" being used to forward the Susan B. Anthony force bill, in that it deliberately suppresses every unfavorable fact about these alleged "victories."

Moreover, why was the United States Senate told nothing in this table about the greatest suffrage victory in 1917—the enfranchisement of 26,000,000 women in Russia—the socialist-suffragist Republic that has deserted America and the allies in this war?

In view of the suffrage table we feel that you will be interested in the facts on this question and therefore inclose a table of all the victories and defeats of woman suffrage at the polls.

It shows that woman suffrage in 25 years won but 11 times at the polls, by an aggregate majority of only 199,214.

On the other hand, in five years woman suffrage has been defeated 18 times at the polls, by an aggregate majority of 1,346,597.

There is no mathematical fact more certain than that the majority of the voters of the United States are opposed to woman suffrage, and the sole object of the Susan B. Anthony amendment is to disfranchise these voters on this question.

The advocates of this bill believe that it will enable them to subject the members of 36 legislatures to so much lobbying and political nagging that the will of the majority of the women and the verdict of the voters at the polls will be ignored.

The suffrage table itself is the best confirmation of this fact, showing as it does that these legislative "victories" upon which they base their greatest claims by no means represent popular sentiment and that when submitted to popular vote these "victories" are emphatically repudiated by the voters at the polls in the vast majority of cases.

Respectfully,

ALICE H. WADSWORTH, President.

Record of woman suffrage at the polls.

DEFEATS (18 IN 5 YEARS).

VICTORIES (11 IN 25 YEARS).

	Majority against.	Majority for.
1890.		
Wyoming (Indorsed with constitution when Territory be- came State).		
1893.		
Colorado-----		6,347
1896.		
Idaho-----		5,844
Utah-----		23,618
1898.		
South Dakota-----	3,286	
1910.		
Washington-----		22,623
1911.		
California-----		3,587

DEFEATS—continued.

	Majority against.		Majority for.
1912.			
Ohio	87,455	Oregon	4,161
Wisconsin	91,478	Arizona	7,240
Michigan (November)	760	Kansas	16,049
1913.			
Michigan (April)	96,144		
1914.			
South Dakota	11,914	Nevada	3,678
Ohio	182,905	Montana	3,714
North Dakota	9,139		
Nebraska	10,194		
Missouri	140,206		
1915.			
New Jersey (granted women the franchise in 1776, but withdrew the right in 1807)	51,108		
Massachusetts	133,447		
Pennsylvania	55,686		
New York	194,984		
1916.			
Iowa	10,341		
South Dakota	5,219		
West Virginia	98,067		
1917.			
Maine	18,234	New York (woman suffrage was imposed on New York State by the pacifist-socialist vote of New York City, aroused by Morris Hillquit and Dudley Field Malone. Outside of New York City, woman suffrage was defeated throughout the State)	102,353
Ohio (repeal)	146,120		
Total majority number of ballots against	1,346,597	Total majority number of ballots for	199,214

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 130) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 449) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 4108) to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries, reported it without amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3264) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Harrison H. Frain, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3267) to correct the military record of William Harman, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4404) repealing that portion of the Indian appropriation act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. L., pp. 1015, 1035), which relates to the disposal of the surplus unallotted lands within the Blackfeet Reservation, in Montana, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 451) thereon.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. TILLMAN. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 10854) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 448) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that the report accompanying the bill be printed in the RECORD so that Senators may examine it, as I expect to call up the bill to-morrow and put it on its passage.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10854) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and as amended recommend its passage.

The amount recommended in this bill is \$1,587,656,540.84, or \$202,840,124 more than carried by the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

The naval appropriation act approved March 4, 1917, carried appropriations totaling \$516,698,802.08, and that has been supplemented by three deficiency bills, bringing the total current year appropriations up to \$1,650,709,668.70. This bill falls \$63,053,127.86 short of that sum. The increase of \$202,840,124 over the House bill is accounted for as follows:

Aviation	\$32,340,150
State marine schools	25,000
Transportation, Bureau of Navigation	6,900,000
Ordnance and ordnance stores	6,328,234
New batteries for ships of the Navy	45,537,712
Ammunition for vessels	34,530,350
Torpedoes and appliances	10,000,000
Reserve ordnance supplies	13,000,000
Contingent Bureau of Ordnance	40,500
Mine depot	3,000,000
Nitrate plant	9,150,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks	3,500,000
Temporary storage	1,000,000
Navy yard, Boston—public works	1,300,000
Navy yard, New York—public works	400,000
Navy yard, Washington—public works	900,000
Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va.	475,000
Naval Academy, Annapolis—public works	2,530,000
Marine Recruiting Station, Port Royal, S. C. (Paris Island)	60,000
Navy yard, Charleston, S. C.—public works	250,000
Navy yard, Pensacola, Fla.—public works	100,000
Submarine base, Key West, Fla.	2,500,000
Navy yard, Mare Island, Cal.—public works	150,000
Navy yard, Puget Sound, Wash.—public works	825,000
Naval Proving Ground, Indianhead, Md.—railroad	550,000
Torpedo station, Newport, R. I.—public works	800,000
Depots for coal—fuel-oil base, Chesapeake Bay	55,000
Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I.—public works	280,000
Naval fuel depot, San Diego, Cal.—public works	175,000
Naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.—public works	500,000
Repairs and preservation, navy yards and stations	1,000,000
Fuel and transportation	1,000,000
Naval Academy, pay of employees	10,578
Marine Corps	
Pay of employees	400
Repairs of barracks	550,000
Commutation of quarters	400,000
Reserve supplies	16,677,200
Improvement and equipment of navy yards for construction of ships	6,000,000
Total increase	202,840,124

The following is a comparative statement of the appropriations for 1918, the amounts of this bill as passed by the House, and the amounts recommended by your committee:

	Appropriated, 1918.	Provided in House bill.	Recommended in this bill.
Pay, miscellaneous:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917 \$1,134,000.00			
Act June 15, 1917.....	1,801,500.00		
	\$2,935,500.00	\$4,350,000.00	\$4,350,000.00
Contingent, Navy:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917 \$46,000.00			
Act Mar. 28, 1918 50,000.00			
	96,000.00	150,000.00	150,000.00
Temporary government for West Indian Islands (act Mar. 3, 1917).	100,000.00	200,000.00	200,000.00
Expenses, Civilian Naval Consulting Board:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917 \$25,000.00			
Act Oct. 6, 1917 75,000.00			
	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
Investigation of fuel oil, etc., Navy.	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00
Aviation, Navy:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917 \$5,133,000.00			
Act June 15, 1917.....	11,000,000.00		
Act Oct. 6, 1917 45,000,000.00			
	61,133,000.00	158,042,000.00	220,383,119.00
Basic patents of aircraft	1,000,000.00		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	107,000.00	()	
State marine schools	50,000.00	50,000.00	75,000.00
Care of lepers, etc., Island of Guam	20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Bureau of Navigation:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917 \$7,910,430.54			
Act June 15, 1917 12,516,124.00			
Act Oct. 6, 1917 850,000.00			
Act Mar. 28, 1918 3,100,000.00			
	31,376,554.54	23,799,010.00	30,629,010.00
Bureau of Ordnance:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917 43,594,350.00			
Act June 15, 1917 198,066,024.00			
Act Oct. 6, 1917 152,677,123.50			
Act Mar. 28, 1918 15,499,737.00			
	409,837,243.50	165,957,248.50	287,511,044.50
Bureau of Yards and Docks:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917 2,784,000.00			
Act June 15, 1917 2,810,000.00			
Act Oct. 6, 1917 2,500,000.00			
Act Mar. 28, 1918 4,500,000.00			
	12,594,000.00	12,000,000.00	15,500,000.00

¹ Appropriation for 1919 carried in another bill.

² The deficiency act approved Mar. 29, 1918, also authorized the incurrence of obligations for ordnance purposes to the extent of \$31,264,000 in excess of appropriations.

	Appropriated, 1918.	Provided in House bill.	Recommended in this bill.
Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917..	\$16,978,255.01		
Act June 15, 1917..	11,903,500.00		
Act Oct. 6, 1917..	17,465,000.00		
Act Mar. 28, 1918..	23,965,072.25		
	\$39,409,827.26	\$36,149,375.00	\$49,999,375.00
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917.....	\$1,445,478.00		
Act June 15, 1917.....	7,300,000.00		
	8,745,478.00	10,890,600.00	10,890,600.00
Pay of the Navy:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917.....	51,023,776.15		
Act June 15, 1917.....	75,508,672.42		
	126,532,448.57	227,372,946.00	227,372,946.00
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917.....	25,244,943.40		
Act June 15, 1917.....	67,424,412.45		
Act Oct. 6, 1917.....	4,500,000.00		
Act Mar. 28, 1918.....	55,000.00		
	97,224,355.85	172,756,841.00	173,756,841.00
Bureau of Con- struction and Repair:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917.....	13,050,000.00		
Act June 15, 1917.....	57,327,340.00		
	70,377,340.00	60,200,000.00	60,200,000.00
Bureau of Steam Engineering:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917.....	12,965,000.00		
Act June 15, 1917.....	34,960,500.00		
Act Oct. 6, 1917.....	10,200,000.00		
	58,125,500.00	50,160,000.00	50,160,000.00
Naval Academy:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917..	909,049.20		
Act June 15, 1917.	380,000.00		
Act Oct. 6, 1917..	18,900.00		
	1,307,949.20	1,242,271.20	1,252,849.20
Marine Corps:			
Paymaster—			
Act Mar. 4, 1917.....	7,132,802.78		
Act June 15, 1917.....	6,398,800.00		
Act Mar. 28, 1918.....	6,000,000.00		
	19,531,602.78	50,135,474.14	50,135,874.14
Quartermaster—			
Act Mar. 4, 1917.....	6,200,385.00		
Act June 15, 1917.....	20,408,151.00		
Act Oct. 6, 1917.....	3,150,000.00		
Act Mar. 28, 1918.....	3,930,000.00		
	33,688,546.00	92,803,682.00	93,753,682.00
Expenses Marine Corps Re- serve.	25,000.00		
Reserve supplies, Marine Corps.			15,677,200.00
Increase of the Navy (on account of vessels heretofore authorized):			
Construction and machinery:			
Torpedo-boat destroyers (act Oct. 6, 1917).....	59,349,000.00		
Torpedo boats (submarines)...	16,816,110.00	125,000,000.00	125,000,000.00
Armor and armament.....	20,000,000.00	32,397,000.00	32,397,000.00
Ammunition.....	3,490,143.00	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00
		7,000,000.00	7,000,000.00
Increase of the Navy (new con- struction):			
Construction and machinery...	33,774,000.00		
Torpedo boats (submarine)....	24,115,170.00		
Torpedo-boat destroyers (act Oct. 6, 1917).....	225,000,000.00		
Armor and armament.....	24,180,000.00		
Ammunition.....	11,087,900.00		
Total increase of the Navy...	417,762,323.00	184,397,000.00	184,397,000.00
Naval emergency fund:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917..	\$115,000,000.00		
Act Oct. 6, 1917..	100,000,000.00		
	215,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00
Improving and equipping navy yard for construction of ships:			
Act Mar. 4, 1917..	\$12,000,000.00		
Act Mar. 28, 1918..	1,570,000.00		
	13,570,000.00	4,000,000.00	10,000,000.00
Grand total.....	1,650,709,688.70	1,384,816,416.34	1,587,656,540.84
Decrease of appropriation, 1919, as compared with 1918.....	63,053,127.86		

Total appropriated:	
Act Mar. 4, 1917.....	\$516,698,802.08
Act June 15, 1917.....	514,805,033.87
Act Oct. 6, 1917.....	561,436,023.50
Act Mar. 28, 1918.....	57,769,809.25

Total..... 1,650,709,688.70

BARTHOLOMEW BAYOU BRIDGE, ARKANSAS (S. REPT. NO. 450).

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 9715) extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew in Ashley County, Wilcox Township, State of Arkansas. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ILLINOIS MEMORIAL COIN.

Mr. OWEN. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 8764) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union. I ask for its present consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 14, to strike out the word "minor" before the word "coins" and insert in lieu thereof "subsidiary silver," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, as soon as practicable, and in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union as a State, there shall be coined at the mints of the United States, silver 50-cent pieces to the number of 100,000, such 50-cent pieces to be of the standard troy weight, composition, diameter, device, and design, as shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and said 50-cent pieces shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value.

SEC. 2. That all laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same regulating and guarding the process of coining, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for security of the coin, or for any other purpose, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized: *Provided*, That the Government shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LEWIS subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate has just passed a proposed act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union. My colleague [Mr. SHERMAN] and myself jointly moved for its passage. I want now to thank the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], chairman of the Banking Committee, who presented this matter, for the haste and promptitude with which the measure was presented, and to thank the whole Senate for unanimously allowing it at this time to go through, when it could, of course, have been postponed by a single objection.

Mr. President, this act of legislation has for its object the striking off of an appropriate coin to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union. I think that I may be permitted at this time to invite the attention of the Senate to the propriety of this tribute to that illustrious State.

At this day, sir, more than a hundred thousand of her sons are moving to the fields of conflict in foreign lands. Thousands of others are encamping at home territory, preparatory to crossing the seas to offer all that they have for the cause which this Republic represents. Her women are yielding their hearts' love—their children—and giving the full of woman's sacrifice. It is history to every Senator sitting here that of all States in the Union that were torn in body and shattered in heart Illinois was not exceeded by any in her endurance at the time of the Civil War. The question of the day, misunderstood by all, over which we spent so much of blood and sacrificed so greatly of everything, finally culminated, sir, into the present concrete union of love and united loyalty. Sir, however much those who were led by Douglas or those who followed Lincoln might have severed State and home in their differences in that hour, the sons of those men, forgetful of the past, have now joined in one great union of every labor and of every offering to the common cause of our Republic for which we went to war. Mr. President, we of Illinois now celebrate the admission of that State into the Union and its living for 100 years the re-

owned life of its history. The Senate has paid its tribute by allowing this bill to be passed. This act is a certification by the Congress of the United States, among other things, that Illinois has been loyal in every hour of every test. At this particular time I could not allow this measure to pass, carrying as it does the tribute of the Senate to the State, without also calling the attention of the Senate to the sacrifice the State has made, the credit it reflects upon the Union, the honor it is to the Republic, and the glory it is to the world.

Mr. President, we cast no reflection upon any State by comparisons; but I express my feeling that when the present cataclysm is ended and the world shall look into the new sky for some guiding star to light the course of those who will remold the future, the prophets of the coming day will turn their eyes to America and behold in the distance, among other planets, the great State of Illinois and, flaming by her side, the inspiring image of her immortal Lincoln.

I want to thank the Senate for the passing of this measure, and to express my appreciation of its tribute.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. From the Committee on Education and Labor I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4557) to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

This bill was introduced by me on yesterday, having been prepared by the Committee on Education and Labor really, and is a substitute for Senate bill 4284, each bill being a bill to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States. As the original bill, 4284, will need no further consideration, I ask that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from its further consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that Senate bill 4284 be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3911) authorizing national banks to subscribe to the American National Red Cross.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7237) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MOON, Mr. BELL, Mr. ROUSE, Mr. STEENSON, and Mr. MADDEN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7634) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. LANGLEY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life and public services of the Hon. John H. Capstick, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 3935) to prohibit the sale, manufacture, and importation of intoxicating liquors in the Territory of Hawaii during the period of the war, except as hereinafter provided, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

ATROCITIES ON WEST COAST OF MEXICO.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have here a clipping from the Oakland (Cal.) Tribune of May 14 in relation to Mexican horrors on the Pacific coast and what the Germans are alleged to be doing. I should like to have the Secretary read it—it is very short—with a view of calling it to the attention of the proper department of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

MEXICAN HORRORS HUN BORN—REFUGEES TELL OF CRUELITIES.

A PACIFIC PORT, May 14.

Terrible and ghastly accounts of atrocities on the west coast of Mexico, instigated by German resident agents there, were authorized to-day by naval officers here, coincident with the arrival of the British steamer *Violet*, under the escort of an American warship, after a thrilling experience by the crew at Mazatlan, where efforts were made to prevent its departure.

A Federal account of the plight that the American mining men are in comes vouched for by reliable authorities. The men are held by the State troops of Tepic, south of Mazatlan, for tribute, and reminders that tribute is wanted are sent every little while to the American authorities. They consist of fingers purporting to be those of the captives.

The first demand called for a ransom of \$5,000, which was paid. The second demand was met by the friends of the prisoners, and then another demand for \$10,000 came, with another ghastly memento. The State Department at Washington now has this case in hand. The Tepic troops are reported in revolt and only this week have seized the important Tepic State ports of San Blas and Las Penas.

German raider reports are received at Mazatlan daily through the Mexican radio stations, the Government subsidized press there given daily accounts of the war, it is reported. The German papers inform the people of Mexico that the allies are struggling, fighting among each other, torn with anarchy, and that the victory of Germany can be expected at any time. The Germans also are said to make every possible use of the blacklist, inciting the Mexican people against this country by misrepresenting the blacklist laws.

A formidable warship, equipped with full sea stores and armed with 4.7-inch guns, is reported at Mazatlan awaiting for a dash to the open sea. The ship is the old Mexican gunboat *Morolos*, sunk by rebels in 1914, that recently was floated and overhauled at great cost. The German firm of Metcher & Co. is said to have taken a leading part in salvaging the ship. Nominally the *Morolos* is under Mexican control, but the American authorities are watching it constantly in the fear that it may dart to sea at the first opportunity and begin privateering work for the German cause.

The Americans say that the Germans at Mazatlan constantly brag of their knowledge of the warships on the Pacific.

Heavy fighting at Acapulco, the most severely important place on the Mexican west coast, is reported continuing. A recent disturbance there resulted in 100 casualties among the natives, the Americans and British there barely escaping to the protection of the warships. American consul at that port reported the situation safe for his charges.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] has had this item read and that the attention of Senators is to be called to the situation on our southern border and on the Pacific coast as well. There is no question at all that the most dangerous propaganda is now being circulated to the south of us. It is the hiding place for conspirators, anarchists, propagandists, and sympathizers with the enemies of our country. While on the Pacific coast I was told by a prominent official of this Government that he suspected that every wireless message which was sent by him to Washington or up and down the coast was caught up in Mexico. For what purpose Senators may conjecture.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Just one moment, Senator, and I will yield. Men whom I have personally known to be intriguers in Mexican revolutionary movements are on our border and are said to be visiting the so-called Mexican Republic in the interest of German propaganda and German usefulness to our enemies. I simply desire publicly to thank the Senator from Connecticut for calling the attention of the Senate through these representations to a condition of affairs on our southern border that demands and should receive the attention of the American Government. The border of Mexico is the hotbed of anarchy and disorder, and the rights of our citizens are ruthlessly trampled upon.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I hope the Senator from Colorado will pardon me. I had intended to yield when he first addressed the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to add to what the Senator from Michigan has said, that there is a relieving feature to the situation to which he has referred in the fact that the representatives of our Government also catch and utilize all wireless messages from Mexico.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; that is probably true; but it is nevertheless a most distressing thing to think that a wireless message may be sent out by our officials only to be caught up and turned over to the enemies of our country now in Mexico. Why we should not give our attention to the disorder upon our southern border, and just across the border in Mexico, is beyond my comprehension. Perhaps this is being done, and I would not willingly add to the burdens now so heavily resting on the shoulders of the President. I know that intriguers are there at work. The money of our enemies is being used freely in Mexico, and it will take lives and blood and money to pay for the tolerance which we are now showing.

I sincerely hope that something more may come of the suggestion made in this article which has been read from the Secretary's desk and from what little I may have said than a mere passing thought.

RENTAL OF PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia, which were, on page 1, lines 3 and 4, to strike out "adjournment sine die of the present session of the Congress" and insert: "expiration of one year after a treaty of peace shall have been definitely concluded between the United States and the Imperial German Government"; on page 1, line 4, after "order," to insert: "decree, or judgment"; on page 1, line 5, after "estate," to insert: "in the District of Columbia"; on page 1, line 5, after "oral," to insert: "or written"; on page 1, in lines 10 and 11, to strike out "except on the ground that" and insert: "which are not inconsistent herewith, unless"; on page 1, in line 11, and in line 1, page 2, to strike out "has failed to take reasonable care of the premises, or"; on page 2, line 1, after "guilty," to insert: "on the premises"; on page 2, line 2, to strike out "is" and insert: "constitutes"; on page 2, line 2, to strike out "amounts to"; on page 2, line 2, to strike out "disturbance" and insert: "breach"; on page 2, in lines 3 and 4, to strike out "of adjoining or neighboring occupiers or a violation of law" and insert: "or other misdemeanor or crime"; on page 2, line 4, to strike out "reasonably" and insert: "necessarily"; on page 2, line 5, after "occupation," to insert: "either"; on page 2, line 6, to strike out "family" and insert: "wife, children, or dependents"; on page 2, line 6, after "while," to insert: "he is"; on page 2, line 6, after "with," to insert: "any branch of"; on page 2, line 7, to strike out "disposed of" and insert: "sold"; on page 2, line 9, after "order," to insert: "decree, or judgment"; on page 2, line 10, after "order," to insert: "decree, or judgment"; on page 2, line 10, to strike out "may" and insert: "shall"; on page 2, line 11, after "order," to insert: "decree, or judgment"; on page 2, line 13, after "order," where it first occurs, to insert: "decree, or judgment"; on page 2, line 13, after "order," where it occurs the second time, to insert: "decree, or judgment"; on page 2, line 15, to strike out "Provided, That" and insert: "and"; on page 2, line 15, to strike out "judicial"; on page 2, line 15, after "remedies," to insert: "at law or in equity"; on page 2, line 16, after "oral," to insert: "or written"; on page 2, after line 21, to insert: "That the term 'real estate' as herein used shall be construed to include any and all land, any building, any part of any building, house, or dwelling, any apartment, room, suite of rooms, and every other improvement or structure whatsoever on land situated and being in the District of Columbia."

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution as just reported by the Secretary. I may say that the amendments proposed are merely formal, I think, except in one case, and that is the first amendment to the joint resolution by which the House of Representatives proposes to extend the operation of the joint resolution during the period of the war and one year thereafter, while the joint resolution as passed by the Senate provided only for its operation during the present session of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there was so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not distinctly hear what the Senator from Delaware said; but as I caught it, the only change proposed to the joint resolution by the House of Representatives, outside of a mere change of verbiage, is in relation to the length of time of its operation. As I understand, the joint resolution as it passed the Senate was to remain in force only until the close of this session of Congress.

Mr. SAULSBURY. That is quite correct.

Mr. SMOOT. While the House has amended it so that it will remain in force for one year after the close of the war.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the passage of the joint resolution in that form conflict with the bill which has been passed by both Houses covering this same subject and which it is expected will be enacted into law at this session?

Mr. SAULSBURY. By no means, Mr. President. The effect of the House amendment will be, as I construe it, to continue the provisions of this joint resolution until such time as they are superseded by the more general legislation which is proposed in the House bill which was sent to the Senate and which the Senate passed in a radically amended form. Of course, the provisions of that bill, which cover practically all cases of rent profiteering and deal comprehensively with the subject will supersede the provisions of this joint resolution when that legislation shall have been finally enacted.

I see no objection to the amendment of the House, assuming that the legislation now under consideration by the conference

committee will be passed, and I rather think that the joint resolution in its present form is somewhat preferable to the joint resolution as it passed the Senate.

The matter has been considered this morning by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and they concurred in this view and authorized me to move the concurrence of the Senate in the amendments of the House.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator one question. I gave no particular consideration to the joint resolution which was passed by the Senate, but, if I comprehend it as just stated by the Senator, it continues against the will of a landlord an existing lease upon a residence until a year after the war.

Mr. SAULSBURY. It maintains the status of the landlord and tenant on the same terms as now exist.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It really attempts to force upon the landlord a contract which he himself has not voluntarily made, does it not?

Mr. SAULSBURY. The Senator may possibly construe it in that way. It really suspends the landlord's remedy for ouster and dispossessing the tenant where the tenant pays his rent regularly and performs the duties of a good tenant.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I give no consideration as to whether it is within the power of Congress to do that; but, if it is done, it seems to me that provision ought to be made for a state of facts where, for instance, a landlord has made a lease for a year, say, and there is a mortgage on the property which falls due at the end of that year, and the landlord's only hope of saving his property is to sell it in the market in order to pay the mortgage and prevent the foreclosure of the mortgage. Unless a provision to cover such a case is put in this joint resolution or is provided for in a subsequent resolution we will be putting the landlord in the position where he has no remedy at all; the tenant continues the existing lease at the existing price; the man who holds the mortgage on the property forecloses the mortgage while it is in the hands of the tenant, and the landlord loses the whole thing; he is deprived of his market to sell his property and pay his mortgage, as it seems to me. I have, however, given the subject no particular consideration.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I hope so.

Mr. SAULSBURY. There is no interference with the right of sale at all, except that the tenure of the present tenant is continued pending the adoption of more comprehensive legislation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; but why does not that to a large extent deprive the landlord of a market for the sale of his property, because it can only be sold subject to a future year's lease and the new purchaser can not get possession of it?

Mr. SAULSBURY. There is a special provision, I may say, in the joint resolution allowing a bona fide purchaser to buy for his own occupancy.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And then the tenant can be evicted?

Mr. SAULSBURY. The tenant can be evicted under those circumstances.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well.

Mr. SAULSBURY. We tried to provide for cases which seemed somewhat along the line indicated by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator as to the status of the general bill, and why it is necessary, inasmuch as that bill has passed both Houses and is now in conference, as I understand, to take up this joint resolution, which is merely temporary?

Mr. SAULSBURY. The necessity for this temporary legislation is to preserve the status of the tenants in the District who have been practically brought into a condition of panic by the notices which they have received that they will be evicted, and by the efforts of so-called rent profiteers to compel tenants to buy, if they can buy, and to raise the rent if the tenants remain on the property.

Mr. McCUMBER. Could we not get the general law through about as quickly as we could get this joint resolution through?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I may call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the only thing we need in order to get this legislation through is the agreement of the Senate to the motion which I have made, which is to concur in the House amendments.

The reason for doing it is possibly obvious. The House bill and the Senate bill to cure this condition, which all admit must be cured, proceed along entirely different lines in their methods of curing the evil. It will require, doubtless, a very great effort on the part of the conferees to agree on a bill, and in the meantime the condition of tenants in this city appeals to the sympathies of one from the testimony which has been adduced.

Mr. McCUMBER. In a nutshell, then, the necessity for immediate action upon this joint resolution is due to the fact that there will probably be considerable delay in arriving at an agreement by the conferees on the general measure.

Mr. SAULSBURY. There will doubtless be considerable delay, but the necessity is due to the present condition of tenants in the District.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator, in regard to the joint resolution, if, so far as its legality is concerned, there is the slightest difference between this case and the power of Congress to pass a law saying that A shall rent his property to B for a certain price, whether he wants to do so or not?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I do not think so.

Mr. KELLOGG. And if the Senator considers that the Congress has any power to pass such legislation?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, my belief is that Congress can pass this act, particularly under the war power. I also think that Congress might suspend civil remedies—of course, not taking property. The only thing that this joint resolution proposes to do is, pending the consideration of comprehensive legislation, to preserve a condition in the District so that possibly, if one were to speak broadly, the operations of the Government may proceed. I think the court might base the necessity of this proposed act on the idea that it was necessary to so control the property in the District that employees of the Government might be comfortably housed while performing their duties.

Mr. KELLOGG. It is, of course, then, perfectly evident that Congress can simply take the property of A and give it to B; there is not any doubt about that, is there?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I myself am not a believer in the commandeering of property unless it is absolutely necessary, but I do not think this goes that far.

Mr. KELLOGG. This does not propose to pay any compensation at all for the taking, except whatever rent may have been heretofore paid.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SAULSBURY. With pleasure.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think this joint resolution, if adopted, may work a great hardship on some people in the District; and why not let it remain unacted upon until it can be determined whether the general bill to which reference has been made can be enacted into law? A man came to me this morning who said he would be seriously affected by this joint resolution. There is a mortgage held on his property, which he has rented to a tenant. He is a poor man, and since this joint resolution passed he has been trying to sell the property to get his money back, but the tenant refuses to let anybody go in to see the property. The tenant is going to hold on under this proposed legislation and will not let anybody see it, and says that she will fight the owner and fight everybody else. So if he attempts to sell it there will be no market for it, because nobody will buy it under the circumstances, and really this man's property will go to waste.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SAULSBURY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no question but that a measure of this kind in its operations will work hardships. Bills of this kind necessarily work hardships, but they are designed to prevent greater hardships, and a greater number of hardships, which men and women have been experiencing and are now experiencing.

I do not pretend to defend my vote for this joint resolution except upon the theory that the District of Columbia having been set aside for the exclusive uses of the Government of the United States, and this great congested population being brought here for that purpose, we must take care of them; and, of course, if these occasional hardships occur, I am satisfied that the ordinary sense of justice, not only in Congress but outside, will take care of them in due season.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has expressed much better than I could have done the thought that was in my mind in attempting to answer the inquiry of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I was not through, although I yielded to the Senator. I understand that when the other bill, which is now pending, passes both Houses and becomes a law this one will be superseded.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Yes; the provisions of this joint resolution will necessarily be superseded by any bill or joint resolution that may be passed subsequently dealing with the same subject.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why not let this joint resolution await the passage of that bill, then? It has passed the Senate and promises to pass the House, and then it will go to conference. I can see great hardships that this legislation may work upon some of the people in this District. Of course, I am as much against profiteering as anybody, but I can see what great hardships will be worked on some of the people.

If the Senator would let this await the action of the Senate and the House, which certainly will be taken in two or three weeks, I see no reason for hurrying along this joint resolution.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I can only say that during that period of two or three weeks the conditions of the landlords and tenants in this District will become such that I think anyone who now suggests delay will be sorry for having suggested it. As a matter of fact, the mere pendency of this joint resolution has quieted down the situation to such an extent that there is not the same outcry since it became known that this joint resolution had passed both Houses; but if it is known that this joint resolution is going to be held up until the general legislation passes you will have in a few weeks a condition of notifying tenants in this District to move and of ousting them such as you have never seen, in my judgment, in any community before.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, if I understand this joint resolution—I had not seen it until this morning—it maintains the present status quo.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Precisely.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And if a man has bargained to buy a piece of property, and the contract of purchase matures, and is in default, the present occupant of the property, even if he is in default on his contract, may maintain his occupancy of that property until a year after the war.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The joint resolution does not attempt to deal with questions relating to defaulted contracts for purchase or sale. It deals only with the matter of landlords and tenants.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think the language is open to that construction. It says that until the expiration of the war, and so forth—

No judicial order, decree, or judgment for the recovery of possession of any real estate in the District of Columbia now or hereafter held or acquired by oral or written agreement or written lease for one month or any longer period—

And so forth.

A written agreement might mean that contracts of sale were included.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I may say that that phraseology was adopted on request of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who thought it should go to that extent to show that an oral agreement was a lease. The House afterwards put in one or two words; but in my judgment it refers only to leases of property.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Of course, I am glad to have the Senator's judgment upon it, although I think that a purchaser of a piece of property upon condition that he could go into possession of it and occupy it until his contract had been fulfilled gets an absolute stay of proceedings against ouster under this rule.

I want to say further, if I am not trespassing, that the whole theory of rent regulation in the District of Columbia, in my opinion, is wrong. I do not think there is any justification for it.

I think a property owner should make money out of his investment, in which event he will continue to build houses and to build apartments, and if he is stripped of any profit there will be no new building in the District. There are plenty of unemployed carpenters in the District of Columbia and adjoining States who would like work of that kind.

I do not think this measure is going to accomplish its purpose. I think it will tend to arrest the further building of houses for rent, apartment houses and private residences, in the District of Columbia, and that it will circumscribe the opportunities of the transient or the permanent residents here very much. On general principle I am opposed to it; but to pass a joint resolution arresting proceedings to oust a defaulting tenant or a defaulting purchaser under contract is high-handed, confiscatory, and outrageous from my point of view, and I will not vote for it.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The Senator is entirely in error. A defaulting tenant can be ousted under the terms of this joint resolution. It preserves the status only in case a tenant has conformed to all the terms of his lease, has paid the rent regularly, and has conducted himself properly as a tenant in the premises. There is no possibility of a defaulting tenant, or a tenant conducting himself improperly as such, holding property against the will of his landlord. All the rights of the landlord remain

under this joint resolution, except the single one of obtaining possession of his property where the tenant has properly conducted himself and paid the rent.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will permit me, while I do not like to take issue with him, I want to ask him a question: Suppose that a landlord sells a house on a contract, with condition that the purchaser of the property shall go into immediate possession and occupy it, continuing to pay monthly payments therefor until the purchase is completed; does the Senator say that this resolution does not prevent such landlord from dispossessing the tenant of his home if he is in default?

Mr. SAULSBURY. The Senator has confused questions of purchase with questions of lease. I am unable myself to distinguish them, but I can only say to him, in reply, that a bona fide purchaser can obtain possession of a property which he desires for his own occupancy. If he is an employee in the Government service, there are special provisions relating to him. A landlord, for his own necessary occupancy, can re-take possession of the property. There is no inhibition on the sale of property, except that the purchaser of property must come into the same position that the landlord occupies as to the tenant, and if he is a Government official he can go into possession of the property at the end of the existing lease.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am informed—I do not vouch for the information, but it comes from a reliable source—that since this joint resolution was introduced a means of evading it has been found in requiring a would-be tenant to purchase the furniture in the apartment at the landlord's price. For example, property worth \$100 is to be taken off the hands of the landlord at \$200 or \$300 or whatever may suit his whim, thus in that indirect way carrying on the same practice which I think this joint resolution, in part at least, will do away with. That is one of the conditions which I think make it necessary to pass this joint resolution as soon as possible.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is much easier to criticize this class of legislation than it is to construct legislation which will meet the situation. We all know that there is a very serious situation in the District of Columbia with which we have to deal, but I do not want to punish the owner who is dealing fairly with the community the same as the profiteer. But I want to say, Mr. President, in view of the fact that there may not be a roll call upon this measure, that I am unable to vote for this joint resolution. I doubt if this is the way to deal with the situation. I am afraid it will have a bad effect instead of a good effect. In the long run it will do much harm to those whom we would help. But that is not the only reason why I am unable to vote for it. I would be willing to trust some one else's judgment as to the policy, but I do not believe this joint resolution is worth the paper it is written on. I do not believe it would stand in the courts if it were up for consideration. Therefore, while I am not going to take up the time of the Senate in discussing it, for fear that there will not be a roll call upon it, I want to record myself as opposed to the joint resolution.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I can not see the slightest difference in principle between this joint resolution and a resolution which provides that A's property shall be taken and given to B for whatever rent B may be willing to pay for it, or without rent at all, so far as principle is concerned. To be sure, it may be presumed that most men have obtained a fair rental for their property. Some may not have done so. Whether they have or not, this bill simply says that A must be the tenant of B for another year.

I sympathize with the people of the District of Columbia who are overcharged and who are laboring under a burden which it is almost impossible to bear; but there is a limit to the point to which a lawyer ought to go in legislation in war times or in any other times. It is setting an example of legislation that is exceedingly dangerous, unless we concede that in time of war there is no Constitution at all; and I do not make any such concession as that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. It is not only a question of no Constitution, but there are certain fundamental principles of right and justice which the courts of this country enforce regardless of the Constitution. If you can say that a man shall not change the status of his property for one reason, you can say that he shall not change the status of his property for another reason; and if you can say that he shall not change the status of his property for a year, you can say the same thing for 10 years. There is no distinction between such a proposition and the principle upon which the Bolsheviks are now trying to erect the government in Russia.

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not see any distinction. I am willing to go as far as anyone in the way of doing anything possible to relieve the people of this District or any other district in this country from the burdens which high prices, and perhaps extortion, have cast upon them, but I am not willing to vote for legislation which apparently is unconstitutional on its face.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this joint resolution is like many others of a new kind; it is rather of a pioneer character. There would be an improvement made with experience and with longer opportunity for reflection; but it was intended to cover a pressing emergency at this time, taking the place of some legislation which it is hoped will be enacted by Congress later. Being of that kind, it seems to me that we can take it up for what it may accomplish for the temporary purpose.

I know that for about 300 years all of the laws of the English-speaking race have been framed by and for landlords for the government of tenants. I have had occasion, as many lawyers in this Chamber have, in days past, to examine the law of landlord and tenant, and I know the tender solicitude with which the common law regards the rights of landlords. Next to human life, the most sacred thing I know of is the right to distraint for rent, to evict a tenant, and to protect the property of the landlord against all comers and by all kinds of contracts.

Here in Washington is the Capital City of the Nation. There are probably 400,000 people in it at the present time. Two hundred and fifty thousand of them, either the heads or the members of families, are tenants. Now, the matter being in that condition, war questions have intruded themselves. The increase in price has come. Some landlords, very much to their credit, have not taken much profit. One who came before the committee testified that he had made an increase of only 50 cents per room per month; that he thought that would equal the difference between the old price of coal and the present price, and some of the costs of help about the house, so that he thought he would come out even. If he did not, as the printed hearings show, he said that he would rather the expense would be on his side than against the tenant.

This spirit is not manifested by all of them, and especially not by the subtenants. The subleases, many of them, that are made, it seems to me, are very grasping in character in many instances. Making a fair average of them, 75 per cent of the subleases made in the city of Washington are sheer, unadulterated robbery. The other quarter are obtaining fair prices for the furniture and a fair profit for the service in leasing out the term which they have taken the trouble to obtain from the landlord.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I am rather inclined to agree with the Senator's view that many of these subleases are founded in that form of extortion that might be characterized as robbery; but can we not legislate so as to catch the robber, rather than the honest citizen who is dealing with his property in a right and proper way? This touches the man who deals with his property righteously and justly just the same as with the robber. We make no discrimination; and it ought to be a fundamental principle of any law to discriminate between the just and the unjust, the righteous and the unrighteous, those who are obeying the law and those who are not.

Mr. SHERMAN. In the times of the Scriptures the rain fell upon the just and the unjust just as it does now. The sinner gets as much benefit out of it as the man who walks righteously. I never knew the Lord to discriminate in sending a shower for the benefit of a crop.

Mr. BORAH. I want to advise the Senator that there comes a time when the Lord has promised us He will discriminate; that He will separate the sheep from the goats; and the Senator had better pay attention to that fact.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have paid some attention to that; I trust as much as the Senator. I have read in Genesis that so long as the earth remaineth seedtime and harvest, heat and cold, winter and summer, and night and day shall not cease. The bow was hung in the heavens as a living evidence that the world was not again to be destroyed by water, with the pledge I have heretofore quoted, that seasons come and go indefinitely, and that there is to be no more destruction of the world by water. Notwithstanding the fact that I am a prohibitionist, I feel safe, I will say to the Senator from Idaho, from any of the aqueous maledictions leveled upon the wicked in Genesis and elsewhere.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has assurance from the rainbow in the heavens that there would be no more drowning, but he has no assurance that we will not starve to death. There is no promise that we will not freeze to death and there is no promise

that our civilization will not be destroyed by chaos. There is no Senator here who has denounced the socialistic trend of affairs more powerfully than the Senator from Illinois. No Socialist would propose so unjust a measure as this. I ask the Senator from Illinois what is the distinction between our civilization and the civilization of the Bolsheviks, except that we undertake to discriminate between those who do right and those who do wrong, regardless of whether they happen to own property or not, while they do not discriminate at all, but punish all alike who are opposed to them or who happen to come within a particular class? Now, I do not want to punish a man simply because he is a landlord, but I do want to reach him if he is a profiteer.

Mr. SHERMAN. Neither do we, the Senator says, but we do. We discriminate between the good landlord and the bad one. This resolution will punish no good landlord. It enables him to take fair charges he voluntarily fixed last October. It is said it treats them all alike, and that is the original complaint, that the good landlord was not segregated from the bad one.

I want to call the attention of the Senator from Idaho to the fact that in the food-administration law there is no difference between the wheat farmer in North Dakota and in southern Illinois. There is no difference between the elevator owner in one place in Oklahoma or in Illinois or in Missouri. They are treated just the same way. The great milling companies in the Mississippi Valley are treated the same way under that law. They are stopped from milling the wheat that they held in their elevators, and had held there and bought and paid for under the right of private contract when the law became operative. The same wheat that came up from Oklahoma to Alton, Ill., to be milled there was private property at the time the law became operative, just as it is now, and just as the landlord owns property now. Still—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. Just a moment. Still, Mr. President, the man who owns wheat, whether he was profiteering or not, was treated just the same way as the man who behaved himself. There was not any discrimination. It was a general rule made to cover the question of that kind of foodstuffs, and this is a general rule made to cover a particular kind of a commodity that the human being in Washington must have.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho first.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Oklahoma has been on the floor for some time, and I yield to him.

Mr. OWEN. Does not this measure take as a standard of fair treatment the contracts which the landlords themselves were satisfied with, and proceed upon that basis, and, being used as a basis, can that be held as unjust or unfair treatment when they are precluded from making extortionate demands beyond the basis which they themselves have already set as fair?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir. That certainly is true. The landlord fixed it himself last October, six months after we declared war. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not think, if the Senator will examine the resolution, that that is in the working of the resolution. The Senator has referred to the wheat crop, and there is the vice of this universal rule which is established, regardless of the position either party may occupy who must obey the rule. In the Minnesota country and in that portion of the United States the farmers realized from wheat \$2 and \$2.20. The farmer in my State realized \$1.60 and \$1.70 under that rule. He was differently situated. He was not so accessible to the market. It was in every sense a thorough discrimination against the very large portion of wheat growers of the United States. The Senator does not believe that that kind of a rule is a fair rule? There is no reason why the Congress of the United States could not have made that rule so that it would apply to the farmer in the West and the farmer in Minnesota under such conditions that both would realize the same from their wheat.

Mr. SHERMAN. It depends upon where you live. The nearer you are to the market, to a large number of ultimate consumers, as the phrase goes, the better the price you get, and the farther you are removed from the market the more is sold out by the common carrier and bored out by the inspector, and naturally so. The farmer in Idaho is unfortunate in location to reach the \$2.20 price. Those in the Mississippi Valley are a little more fortunately situated. There are many of the large mills of the country that convert it into a more portable and cheaply carried form, and therefore the farmer there gets a better price, because he is nearer the mills and nearer some

of the large consuming centers of the country. But that ought not to be made a penalty upon those who are more fortunately located.

Here are men and women in Washington who are unfortunately located. The landlord is fortunately located. That is no reason why we ought to deny to the tenants the protection of the law or the resolution, whichever it shall be. If we make that the rule, then the law must be made to fit localities. On the other hand, the Food Administration act was made to fit the United States, and those who are unfortunately located receive a lower price naturally because of their being far removed from market.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator from Illinois if that applies to the finished product?

Mr. SHERMAN. Not so much so. It does some.

Mr. BORAH. Why does it not apply to the finished product?

Mr. SHERMAN. Any part of it?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. Why should not the same rule apply, if we make laws here which are to be universal in their application, and so forth?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. All right. Ask your questions all together and I will answer all at once.

Mr. BORAH. I have asked a question of the Senator, and he can proceed.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, I do not need to remind the Senator from Illinois that people do not eat whole wheat. We have to manufacture it. It has to be ground into flour. The Senator made a comparison stating that the people who live out West were not as fortunate as people who live in the Mississippi Valley. Has the Senator taken into consideration what it costs the people in the West for what flour they consume, or, rather, what the wheat costs those who really consume it?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not want to break in upon the subjects that have been discussed by the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from North Dakota, but there is a point in this bill or resolution which interests me a good deal. The Senator from Illinois is discussing it as though it were confined to landlords and tenants, and the effect of the bill as between landlords and tenants is simply to continue the lease indefinitely; but the occupation is dependent upon the performance by the tenant of the terms of the lease. There is an element of fairness about that. But the resolution covers other kinds of possession as well. For instance, I put my own case, because I recently did this thing. I sell a piece of property in Washington. The payments are to be made annually, monthly, or every three months, or whatever period may be determined upon. A part of the agreement is that the purchaser shall be put in possession of the property. This resolution not only prevents the seller of the property from taking any process at all for the recovery of possession, but does not even require the purchaser to make the payments that he has agreed to make in order to be entitled to possession.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois does not believe that that ought to be put in the law. Not only it ought not to be put in the law from the standpoint of justice and fair dealing, but I am sure the Senator will agree with me that it is clearly unconstitutional and opposed to the fundamental compact of society if put into the law.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will take up the question of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] first. We would be better off if we did eat the wheat whole. It would last longer and would be healthier. We would have fewer intestinal troubles, which now are a part of the usual surgical difficulties, especially in families of great wealth. Highly bolted flour has been a menace to humankind for many years. Nature knows more about how to prepare food for ourselves than we do ourselves. The chemist and miller have done more to injure the human race than he has ever done himself. We are eating whole-wheat bread now, and we are better off for it. It goes further, the Government thinks. I do not know that they have the health question in mind, but the entire American people would be better off, I say to the Senator from North Dakota, if we ate wheat in nearer its whole form of the berry than having it highly purified and bolted. We gain nothing in health. We gain very much to our disadvantage. Many farmers complain since highly bolted flour has come into use in the last 20 years.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I want to answer the rest of the question.

Mr. GRONNA. But right there—

Mr. SHERMAN. All right; I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows that the consumer is charged a higher price for unbolted flour than he is charged for bolted flour.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Is that an injustice to the consumer? The Senator was stating a parallel case. He was comparing the food-administration law. I understand he is defending this measure by the act which is known as the food act. We know that the consumer is paying a higher price for raw wheat than he is paying for bolted wheat. Is not that true?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir. That is not because it is the whole-wheat flour. It is because it is war times and we are feeding our allies as well as ourselves, and a large number of farmers have left the field of production and gone to the military field. It is not because we are getting what is popularly supposed to be a purer brand of flour and paying a higher price, so that somebody is profiting unduly. It is because of the market condition.

Let me continue. The flour having been prepared from the wheat berry, is shipped into the market in much less bulk than when it left the local elevator or the farmer to be carried to the milling center. Everybody knows it who studied the freight question and the capacity of the rolling stock of the carriers. All the cars accumulate in the eastern centers. That is because from the West, as a rule, a greater tonnage of bulky merchandise or unmanufactured merchandise comes to the East. That takes the space. When the cars are emptied of the bulky merchandise, the grain unmanufactured, or if it is not the coarse grain unmanufactured, or if it is flour not made up yet at the plant of the different baking or biscuit companies and put into boxes, it requires bulk; but when it is in the highly manufactured form, ready for consumption, run through the bakeshops and ready to go from the box to the table of the consumer, it then occupies a comparatively small part of a freight car.

The result is that freight accumulates in the East and the empties have to be sent back West. That is the standing evidence of the fact that from the West comes the coarse form of merchandise, not so highly manufactured, as flour unmanufactured. The price is added to it. It reaches the form of food-stuffs in its final state. Of course, the price is higher the nearer it reaches that form. When we pay for it in its finished form there is less of the freight in the cost than there is in the bulky grain.

The query of the Senator from North Dakota is based on that fact. The more highly manufactured the merchandise is the lower the price of freight in the transportation. That is the natural effect of it. That I think explains mainly the question asked by the Senator from North Dakota.

Now, to return to the query of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], the question it seems was one interfering with the right of property, the private right, and that I have been at times somewhat vociferous in my criticisms of socialistic schemes. I have, and I expect to be more so in the future if it is possible within my limited knowledge of the question and my ability to express myself.

Mr. President, if this be a socialistic scheme then the moratorium for the benefit of the soldier in the camp or field is socialistic. The moratorium now delays the collection of every debt owed by any person in the military or naval service of the United States. I have several constituents at home holding considerable in the form of negotiable paper against those in the military service. I have written them, Mr. President—all of them, where they have taken the trouble to write me to get the current information before the law was well known—and I have sent them copies of the act so that they might know what their rights were. They can not collect; they can not sue on a note; they can not foreclose on a mortgage, whether maturity of principal has come or not, or it is merely the maturity of interest. They are bound to hold their indebtedness as it now is until the end of the war or a given period thereafter.

Now, I do not think the holder of negotiable paper, of a note secured by a mortgage on real estate, where the maker or debtor is in the military or naval service, has any more right than a landlord or vice versa. If the landlord has more right here than the one holding the paper against one in the military service, then he can rightfully criticize this resolution and the legislation that will follow it.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. On that point I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Illinois. Suppose the Senator from Illinois had done as many do in Washington—that he had leased his house for two summer months at a small rental

because he would rather have it occupied than to have it vacant. This bill is passed. He must continue that lease and his house is taken away from him for a year after the war closes for the rent he has been receiving as a matter of accommodation for two or three months. Does the Senator from Illinois believe that that is constitutional or within the power of Congress to do when it is merely applied to landlords in the city of Washington?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do, if any such stay laws in war are. If that be not constitutional in a joint resolution, Mr. President, then the moratorium is unconstitutional. Those employed in the civil service of the Government in Washington have as much right to protection, they have as much constitutional right to appeal to Congress and to obtain legislation for protection for those in the civil service of the Government as those in the military and naval service have a right to appeal for and to obtain, as they have done, proper protection against the collection of debts.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator let me ask him a practical question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Suppose a landlord had rented a house last year for \$100 a month to a tenant for one year or for a year and a half, the condition being that the landlord should keep it heated in the wintertime, but that after the lease was made difficulties attending the coal situation ensued and added greatly to the expense which the landlord was under; does the Senator from Illinois think that a bill should be passed by Congress maintaining the status quo of that tenant without imposing any additional burden upon him? Would that be just or equitable or fair?

Mr. SHERMAN. It would not be if imposed as a permanent rule, but this joint resolution is not intended for a permanent rule; it is only intended to sustain present conditions until the legislation following in the form of a bill is enacted. The joint resolution is to remain in force during the war and for a given time afterwards, when proper legislation covering the subject may be brought before both branches of Congress and be enacted; but, for temporary purposes, I think this proposed legislation is within the power of Congress.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] propounded practically the same query, as to whether a landlord can be kept from the possession of his property, amounting to a dispossession of the landlord. I answered that the same as I have answered the query of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], that if the law granting a moratorium is valid, if these laws that sustain the right of one who is in the military or naval service to be free from annoyance, that his family shall be free from dispossession or eviction while the head of the family is absent in the service, if these matters are based upon a sound reasoning, then it is likewise as to the persons here in Washington who are living in the Capital City—a city the like of which there is no other one in the United States—in that event, this joint resolution and the succeeding legislation are valid.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Illinois just referred to me as having raised the same question about the propriety of this legislation as between landlord and tenant. The Senator is in error about that. I made the suggestion that where a purchaser had entered into possession under a contract of sale or purchase there ought to be at least a provision in the measure that if the purchaser did not fulfill the terms of the contract of purchase the seller could resume possession, just as the landlord under the contract can resume possession if the tenant does not perform the conditions of the contract of lease.

Mr. SAULSBURY rose.

Mr. SHERMAN. In just a moment I will yield. The tenant must keep the terms of the lease as provided on page 2. There are some matters in this joint resolution as it left the other House, if I were myself writing it, that I, together with my colleagues on the committee, should prefer had been otherwise disposed of, but rather than delay it I was willing to take it as it was.

Mr. President, I wish to say before yielding to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] that I will suggest to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that I myself will take my chances when the final accounting is had, with my many imperfections and sins, with those who are covered in the bill or the joint resolution. I will take my chances, Mr. President, with Mr. Munsey, although he is the owner of newspapers and magazines, and is a gentleman, no doubt, not to be spoken of

without fear and trembling; one who will level his maledictions and shed printer's ink like gore upon the battle field on those who offend him—I will take my chances with Mr. Munsey in the final accounting with as much courage as I ever did anything in my life if he perseveres in his present conduct. Before the committee, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, the evidence shows that Mr. Munsey—reformer as he is—who is leasing to the Government space for which he collects under the old rate \$10,500 a year, has notified the Government that on the 1st day of July, 1918, he will raise it to \$31,500 a year for the same space in the same building in the same city. I will take my chances, I will say to the Senator from Idaho, alongside of the redeemed and regenerated Mr. Munsey when it comes to a question of profiteering upon the Government at the rate of 300 per cent, as he is doing according to the evidence at the hearing before the committee.

I would be perfectly satisfied if there were an explanation made—and I hope it will be made—in which it would be shown that this is erroneous; but it was the testimony a long time ago, heard before the House committee and heard again before the Senate committee. There has been no explanation, there has been no contradiction by the agent of the building, who is convenient of access here any day. So I am led to the conclusion that in the dire need of the Government, when it is collecting from the taxpayers of the country all that it in justice feels that it can collect in intervals from them to meet the great exigencies of the war, along comes this gentleman and insists upon collecting from the Government 300 per cent more than he did the year before. It is an instance, Mr. President, of another reformer who has lost his civic chastity in the mad rush for gain.

The mere fact that Mr. Munsey may own newspapers does not terrify many of us. I have seen a great many gentlemen who have owned newspapers but could not get anywhere when they ran for office. I have seen them run for office all the way from alderman in my own city and in Chicago to Senator of the United States, and I never in my life saw a great newspaper editor of a metropolitan paper elected.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there are some newspaper men who are now Members of this body.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am entirely impartial in my observations if there are. The Senator will notice I made no exceptions in the particular group.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think the matter covered by this joint resolution can probably be expedited by asking leave to withdraw my motion to concur in the House amendments and moving that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives and ask for a conference with the House on the amendments of the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not rise to object, but before the motion is put I should like to ask leave to insert in the RECORD a letter which I received this morning bearing on this subject. I do not vouch for the facts set out in the attached statement and communication, but it is a very intelligent communication and conceivably states the situation quite fairly, I think. I do not even know personally the writer, but I am acquainted sufficiently with the conditions in the District of Columbia myself to believe what he is stating to be a correct representation of the situation so far as it goes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIDELITY STORAGE CO.,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1918.

Senator D. U. FLETCHER:

The writer is in the building and real estate business, and, of course, is interested in the various bills under consideration by Congress to prevent profiteering.

Doubtless some unwarranted raises in rent have been made, but some increase is necessary to cover the enormous increases in the cost of maintaining and upkeep of real estate.

The enormous prices paid for labor and material on the buildings erected by the Government is largely responsible for the increased cost.

A carpenter recently working for me at \$5 per day worked last week on a Government building at Sixth and B Streets and drew \$107 for the week's labor, including overtime. An electrician formerly worked for me (recently) drew \$120 for one week's pay on a Government building.

Many laborers—not trained mechanics—have been taken from my force and put to work on Government buildings, under the guise of carpenters; they are put to work doing common labor, and with allowance of time and half and double time frequently draw \$75 to \$90 per week.

The upkeep of real estate has increased in greater degree than cost of food, shoes, and all other merchandise, dependent largely on cost of labor.

A building must be kept in repair. Roofing, glass, outside woodwork, parking, plumbing, heating plant, electric work, painting, papering, etc. Material and labor have gone up over 100 per cent on all of the above. Carpenters two years ago were paid \$3.50; now \$5 to \$6. Painters two years ago were paid \$3; now \$5 to \$6. Laborers were formerly paid \$1.50 per day; now \$3.50 to \$4 per day.

Plumbers, electricians, masons in like proportion. Wall paper, paint, plumbing material, tin, glass, etc., are more than double. Labor is much less efficient. No one cares whether he keeps his job or not.

An insurance trust is operating in the District, which has raised insurance in some instances 300 per cent. Congress passed a bill presumably attempting to stop this, but by careless wording of the law insurance business slipped through.

Probably 70 per cent of owners are obliged to borrow money. Interest rates, formerly 4½ and 5 per cent, have advanced to 6 per cent on all except the choicest loans. Borrowers are obliged to pay a commission in addition, which makes the rate about 6½ per cent.

Awnings and screens have increased about 200 per cent and last about three years.

People not familiar with real estate business overlook the annual depreciation, which will average on brick buildings 2½ per cent on the whole building. Plumbing must be renewed on an average of 25 years, 4 per cent depreciation; electric work, 20 years, 5 per cent depreciation; roof, 8 to 10 years, 12½ to 10 per cent; heating plant, 25 years, 4 per cent; outside blinds, etc., 20 years, 5 per cent. This is in addition to the annual repairs of leaks and minor replacements.

Taxes are higher. Now owner pays for renewal of street pavements, resetting curb, relaying sidewalk, etc.

Where service is supplied coal formerly \$3.85 per ton now \$8.85 per ton put in cellar. Removing ashes about three times increased. Fireman's wages about double. Elevator operators about double. Telephone switch labor about double. Hall cleaners, janitors, and manager about double. All cleaning supplies, soap, brushes, etc., about double. Elevator repairs, new cables, grease, etc., and labor about 300 per cent.

I can't make this letter too long, but many additional items all go to make up the annual cost of carrying real estate.

These are facts which can not be obscured by abuse of owners.

If ignored by intemperate legislation, it must necessarily stop all building for rental purposes. Just as effectively as if a ukase called for shoes, to be sold at prewar prices, no shoes would be for sale in the District.

The city is growing and should have more dwellings to accommodate the inhabitants.

The threat of confiscatory legislation has now scared nearly every owner into selling his house, rather than continue renting.

Practically no building is done without borrowed money for part of the cost. The proposed legislation has already made it almost impossible to borrow money on new projects.

JAMES L. KARRICK.

A REAL ESTATE FACT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 17, 1918.

A man died a few years ago and left two houses to his widow in expectation that the rents would maintain her during her declining years. These houses are located in a fashionable neighborhood, they cost 12 to 15 years ago about \$12,000 each to build, the lots cost about \$3,000 each, a total cost of about \$15,000.

The husband to help build the houses had borrowed on one \$7,000 and on the other \$5,000. The widow had been obliged to raise an additional \$1,200 secured by a second mortgage, to pay the carrying expenses during the vacancies.

During 1917 one of the houses was vacant, the other rented to a gentleman at, per year—\$660
The widow's expenses for the house that was rented was:
Interest and commission on \$5,000—\$275
Interest and commission on \$1,200, second mortgage—120
Taxes—78
Insurance—10
Water—12
To real estate agent for collection—33

528

Leaving for repairs and income on \$8,800 invested in the house—132

No income was received from the vacant house next door. The widow, in desperation, tried to save both houses from foreclosure, but failing to pay her taxes and interest, the rented house sold at foreclosure of the first mortgage.

The lessee then notified the purchaser that unless certain repairs were made he would move out. A list was submitted which was estimated to cost about \$2,000. Failing to get these repairs the lessee thereupon proposed to take the widow's other house at \$660 provided \$200 was expended on repairs. The widow, hoping to save the balance of her inheritance, agreed to this, provided the lessee would spend the \$200 and deduct from the rent \$25 per month until reimbursed. The result is she is behind in taxes and interest and is about to lose this house also, under foreclosure sale. The lessee is not to blame for making the best bargain he could for himself.

But do you propose to enact a law compelling this poor woman to continue to accept \$660 for what formerly brought \$1,200, and which she would now have no difficulty in getting again?

Such a law means not only a temporary loss of income but total financial ruin. Hundreds of cases can be shown of just as great hardship. All this poor widow begs for is a law giving her a reasonable rental.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say further, Mr. President, that I am glad that the committee has asked that the joint resolution go to conference. It seems to me it involves a monstrous proposition. I have no acquaintance with Mr. Munsey or any of his affairs, and I am not attempting to defend him, nor would I for a moment utter anything here by way of justification or excuse for the profiteers who are making money at the expense of the people by extortionate charges, but I am impressed with the fact that most of the profiteering comes from subtenants and

sublessees, people who have rented from landlords, who let them have the premises at reasonable prices, and who have themselves furnished, in some instances, apartments or buildings and sublet them and are making enormous and exorbitant profits by subletting those premises. That condition ought to be adequately dealt with and remedied. I would say a word in behalf of the honest, straightforward, patriotic landlords of the District, and there are landlords in that relation. There are plenty of people here who have invested their money in apartments and other buildings in good faith, and who are entitled, it seems to me, to some little consideration. I will admit that the tenants are entitled to consideration also, but the people who own property and who have developed that property, who have invested their money in it, are entitled to some slight consideration at the hands of Congress. This joint resolution would deprive them largely of any sort of control of their own property, even the right of possession of their property.

Take, for instance, a landlord who rented a house last October—and the leases in the District usually run from October to October—and suppose the tenant occupying such a house or such an apartment has not violated the lease by committing any of the torts or wrongs which would violate the covenants usually embodied in leases, but is nevertheless undesirable and unsatisfactory, and suppose the lease by its very terms and the solemn covenants contained in it expires on the 1st of next October. In those circumstances Congress undertakes to say that the owner of the property can not have possession of it; that the tenant must stay there on the same terms as to rent, provided he pays his rent—and, of course, he will do that—not only for another year or two years or three years, but for an indefinite period, until the expiration of one year after the treaty of peace, and the Lord only knows when that will be; nobody can guess, nobody can say. It is an indefinite appropriation by the Government of a man's property, and denying him, the owner of the property, the right to its possession. I never heard of such a monstrous proposition. It is absurd; it is too ridiculous, it seems to me, to be urged for a moment. It may be that the landlord has rented that property at a figure much below its actual value. Undoubtedly it is true, and everybody knows it is true, that the expense of heat and light for apartments has increased and the expense for repairs has greatly increased. I do not know that the taxes have increased very much; the taxes in the District, I think, are quite reasonable; but generally throughout the country the taxes have increased. At any rate, however, all these necessary charges against the property have greatly increased since last October; but in spite of all that the landlord, the owner of the property, is not permitted to get one cent more than he did a year ago for those premises, and he is obliged to keep there the present occupant, no matter how undesirable that occupant may be.

I am very glad that the Senator from Delaware has seen fit to move that the joint resolution go to conference, in the hope that they will bring it back in a somewhat more reasonable shape than it is at present.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I wish only to say a word. I can not permit my friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], to make the statement he has about this joint resolution unless he can say to me that he has read the testimony which the committee with great industry took before proposing the joint resolution. Of course, the speech just made by the Senator from Florida is the old-fashioned property holder's speech in favor of protecting the landlord. I think that one of the great things this war is doing for us everywhere is making the people of this country and throughout the world feel more keenly the rights of humanity, as compared to the rights of property, and appreciate that we can not deal as tenderly in all cases as we have heretofore done with the rights of property when the rights of men and the rights of women come in conflict with the rights of property.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am not going to oppose the request of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] to send this joint resolution to conference, although I can not see how the conference committee can meet any of the objections which have been made to the joint resolution today. All the substantial provisions of the joint resolution have been agreed to and passed by both the House and the Senate. The amendments made by the House are in a sense immaterial; they do not go to the substance of the joint resolution as it passed the Senate, and when the conferees bring it back, unless they violate the rules of conferences, the objections that have been made to it will apply to any conference report that can be brought in here, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if I may say just a word? I do not care to be put in the position of speaking for the interests of profiteers or of championing specially the interests

of landlords. I am simply appealing for fair consideration for them, as well as consideration for tenants. My impression was when this joint resolution originally passed the Senate that it was intended to cover a situation until a general bill, which was to apply not only to landlords and not only to tenants but to other conditions in the District, might be agreed upon. The Senate subsequently passed that bill, and it went back to the House. If this joint resolution should be limited to the time when that legislation can be written into law, I am agreeable that it should be done, but the present proposition is to have the joint resolution remain a law for a year after a treaty of peace. That is my objection to it.

I will say further, with reference to a good many of the landlords, that I presume over 50 per cent of the property owned here is under mortgage, and under heavy mortgage. It will be utterly impossible for them to meet their obligations if they are to be deprived of their reasonable rights in connection with their own property.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I might say that it is possible for the conferees to meet the objection which the Senator from Florida makes. We can limit the time to less than one year after the close of the war and put it as the Senate passed it, or make it either a shorter or a longer time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY].

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. POMERENE, and Mr. SHERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, bills and joint resolutions are in order.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4569) to establish the Mount Desert National Park in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 4570) granting a pension to John E. Graham (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4571) granting an increase of pension to Stephen R. Clark (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 4572) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dickens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 4573) granting an increase of pension to Charles Belknap (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4574) granting an increase of pension to Adoniran C. Harper (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HARDING submitted an amendment providing that the Paymaster General of the Navy shall cause to be paid to Mrs. Susie A. Van Kirk, mother of the late Dean R. Van Kirk, ensign, National Naval Volunteers, an amount equal to one year's pay at the rate received by that officer at the date of his death, May 1, 1917, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

LIGNITE COALS.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

On motion of Mr. MARTIN, it was

Ordered, That the junior Senator from Idaho, Mr. NUGENT, be assigned to membership upon the Committee on Finance.

THE CALENDAR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII, and that unobjectioned bills be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the regular order.

Mr. MYERS. Not unobjectioned bills. The regular order is the calling of the calendar for anything, as I understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar, and that unobjected bills only be called. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The first business on the calendar was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to appropriate \$3,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to prosecute the work of eradicating the southern cattle tick.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) authorizing the President to appoint two additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1725) to stimulate the production of food upon private and public lands within reclamation projects, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) extending the authority of and provision for the committee appointed under S. Res. 92, Sixty-third Congress, first session, to investigate the charges of alleged attempts to influence legislation, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) providing for the appointment of a joint committee to be known as the joint committee on the conduct of the war, was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to investigate the causes of the recent riots in East St. Louis, Ill., and to report thereon, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States conferring upon women the right of suffrage was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President without the intervention of the electoral college, establishing their term of office from the third Tuesday of January following their election, and fixing the time when the terms of Senators and Representatives shall begin, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that joint resolution is adversely reported. The Senator reporting it is not in the Chamber, but I do not think there will be any objection to its consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Why not dispose of it?

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask that it go over.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 385) to authorize mining for metalliferous minerals on Indian reservations was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

NONMINERAL ENTRY OF LANDS IN ALASKA.

The bill (S. 950) to provide for the nonmineral entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing coal, phosphate, nitrate, potash, oil, gas, or asphaltic minerals in Alaska was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. I believe the bill has been read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read in full. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, for information, does the Senator from Utah know the purport of this bill? My only object in making the inquiry is that I do not wish to let a bill pass

with my assent, though I would not work an obstruction, that gives to any private ownership in this country control of the coal and oil. I have long been an advocate, and would say to the Senator now that my purpose is to continue the advocacy, of the doctrine that coal and oil, the substances of fuel, ought to be taken charge of by the Government and supervised in their disposition, whether by lease or otherwise, or by sale, as the Secretary of the Interior may direct. I am opposed to the policy of private ownership of these minerals.

Mr. SMOOT. I will assure the Senator that there is nothing in the bill with that in view. It is a departmental bill, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, who asks for its passage.

Mr. LEWIS. Since the Secretary takes that attitude, I certainly shall interpose no obstruction.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BUSINESS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 23) granting to the State of Nevada 7,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State university of the State of Nevada was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 90) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. That may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3311) to increase and expedite the supply of munitions of war was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that had better go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a statue of James Buchanan, a former President of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1795) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3522) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

Mr. LODGE. I do not see in the Chamber the Senator who has the bill in charge, but I should like to ask whether that bill has not been entirely covered by the espionage act?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it has. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is not in the Chamber, but I think that is quite true.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill will go over.

INTERNATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF DEMOCRACIES.

The resolution (S. Res. 196) to print the pamphlet entitled "An International Confederation of Democracies under a Constitution" as a Senate document was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. That may be indefinitely postponed. The article referred to was printed in the RECORD under extension of remarks in the House. I ask to have the resolution indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 947) validating certain homestead entries was announced as next in order.

Mr. LENROOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 951) to provide for the sinking of artesian wells, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3783) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who

served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

OREGON & CALIFORNIA RAILROAD CO.

The bill (H. R. 5489) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange for lands in private ownership lands formerly embraced in the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, in the administration of the act of June 9, 1916, entitled "An act to alter and amend an act entitled 'An act granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Central Pacific Railroad, in California, to Portland, in Oregon,' approved July 25, 1866, as amended by the acts of 1868 and 1869, and to alter and amend an act entitled 'An act granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Portland to Astoria and McMinnville, in the State of Oregon,' approved May 4, 1870, and for other purposes" (39 Stat. L., p. 218), is hereby authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to exchange lands formerly embraced within the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and vested in the United States by said act for other lands of approximately equal aggregate value held in private ownership, either within or contiguous to the former limits of said grant, when by such action he will be enabled thereby advantageously to consolidate the holdings of timberlands by the United States: *Provided*, That all lands and timber secured by virtue of such exchange shall be disposed of in accordance with the terms and provisions of said act of reversion.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN.

The bill (S. 3527) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," approved March 3, 1885, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has already been read. It is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECLAMATION OF ARID LANDS.

The bill (S. 758) to increase the productive agricultural area of the United States by the reclamation of arid and swamp lands was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

KATHERINE MACDONALD.

The bill (S. 2975) for the relief of Katherine Macdonald was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "\$9,819" and insert "\$9,117," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$9,117 to and for Katherine Macdonald, of Butte, Mont., for and on account of unpaid claims held by her on account of work and services performed on or supplies furnished for the construction of the Corbett Tunnel, a part of the Shoshone reclamation project in the State of Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3439) for the relief of certain homestead and desert-land entrymen was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I shall have to ask that that go over for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 132) to amend section 14 of the food-control act by increasing the guaranteed minimum price of wheat for the crop of 1918 from \$2 to \$2.50 per bushel was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, that amendment was put in the agricultural bill. As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] is not here, I shall ask that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

DISTRICT JUDGE FOR CALIFORNIA.

The bill (S. 2910) providing for an additional judge for the northern district of California was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all of sections 2 and 3, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional judge for the northern district of California, who shall reside in said district and shall possess the same qualifications and have the same powers and jurisdiction and receive the same salary now prescribed by law in respect of the present district judges therein.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, when this bill was reached upon the calendar, yesterday or the day before, I objected to its consideration. It was called some time before that, and I then also objected to its consideration.

I shall not interpose any objection now, for the reason that I do not feel that I should discriminate between my friend the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and those who are favoring other bills for similar purposes; but I think it is a mistake to increase the number of judges now upon the Federal bench, just as I have opposed at various times in my own State the increase in the number of judges upon the State bench. The number of our judiciary is enlarging beyond all reason and all necessity. I am quite aware that in making that statement I shall provoke the very decided opposition of many of my associates, but I am expressing an opinion that is the result of considerable observation and has been long entertained.

The number of judges in Great Britain is less than the number of judges in the State of Illinois, while the population which they serve is infinitely larger, and the reason for the difference in the two is found in the different methods of procedure. The judges in the older country are at work practically all the time. Our judges think they do pretty well if they meet at 10 o'clock, take a recess for lunch, and adjourn for the day at 4 or half past 4, and that regardless of the state of the docket or the character of the business then before the court. If instead of doing that, the judges would perform 50 per cent more work that might be done, and done efficiently, instead of there being need for more judges at a bigger salary roll the tendency might be the other way.

In my State, having a population of a million in round numbers, we have one district judge. He occasionally requires some assistance outside and gets it in the assignment of a judge from another district to help him out. Now we are entering upon the practice, and it will grow and continue to expand, of relieving overcrowded dockets by increasing the number of judges. The precedent once established grows like a Canada thistle. There are a number of such bills on the calendar or at least several of them have been enacted or have passed the Senate during the present session. The people of my State will very soon be demanding another judge, possibly two of them, and their demand will be reinforced by the precedent to which I refer. I have no doubt that in the discharge of my duties here I shall be required to advocate an increase of the Federal judiciary in my State, notwithstanding the fact that I am convinced, and I know the judge of that district is convinced, that it is not necessary.

It is for that reason I have made these objections. I think they are well founded, and I shall always continue to think so.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. Has objection been made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was no objection made.

Mr. LODGE. Then I ask for the regular order. Under this unanimous consent I do not think indefinite debate is in order.

Mr. PHELAN. I am quite willing to refrain from making any remarks. I understand the Senator from Colorado has not objected to the consideration of the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR DEFALCATIONS OF NAVY PAYMASTER'S CLERK.

The bill (S. 3125) for the relief of certain enlisted men of the United States Navy was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following-named men the sums of money following their names, respectively, or so much thereof as may be found by the Secretary of the Navy, upon evidence satisfactory to him to have been lost by said men and upon certificate from the Secretary of the Navy as to the amount to be paid: A. Balton, \$67; Bernard C. Biezunski, \$36; C. C. Bleam, \$57; W. J. Brown, \$50; Lemuel F. Dixon, \$50; Elmer M. Hall, \$30; J. Hello, \$5; W. P. Hunt, \$67; C. E. Jordan, \$47; T. E. Kent, \$40; Gustave A. Lohse, \$76; L. E. Looney, \$50; George L. Rice, \$60; R. R. Spratt, \$50; E. A. Stoner, \$62; Max Szawajkowski, \$102; E. T. Taylor, \$50; Wenford P. Thorogood, \$55; N. J. Turpin, \$50; W. H. Wilson, father of A. W. Wilson, \$87; Elmer Wilson, \$50; Robert Wittig, \$55; John A. Wohl-gren, \$55; and the sum of \$1,311, or so much thereof as may be found, as above provided, to have been lost, is hereby appropriated to carry

out the provisions of this act, the said sums being the amounts claimed to have been lost by the parties named by reason of the defalcations of former paymaster's clerk, Theodore N. Carter, United States Navy, who deserted January 10, 1912, and who is still in desertion.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2120) for the relief of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). The bill will go over.

The bill (S. 3011) for the relief of Winfield S. Solomon was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3646) to grant rights of way over Government lands for reservoir purposes for the conservation and storage of water to be used by the city of San Diego, Cal., and adjacent communities was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

The next business on the calendar was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 136) providing for the registration for military service of the subjects or citizens residing in the United States of a foreign country with whose Government the United States has concluded or hereafter concludes a convention or agreement consenting to such aliens being drafted into the military forces of the United States under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," and all amendments thereto.

Mr. LODGE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution goes over on objection.

The bill (S. 1478) for the relief of John F. Kelly was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will go over.

The bill (S. 164) for the relief of Adolph F. Hitchler was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over on objection.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a statue of James Buchanan, a former President of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will go over.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

The bill (S. 2104) to amend sections 4402, 4404, and 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was announced as next in order on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been heretofore considered and the first amendment of the Committee on Commerce, increasing the number of supervising inspectors from 10 to 11, was agreed to. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 17, to strike out "\$3,600" and insert "\$3,450," so as to read:

Each supervising inspector shall be entitled to a salary of \$3,450 a year and his actual necessary traveling expenses while traveling on official business assigned him by competent authority, together with his actual and reasonable expenses for transportation of instruments, which shall be certified and sworn to under such instructions as shall be given by the Secretary of Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will go over on the request of the Senator from Utah.

ADULT ILLITERACY.

The bill (S. 4185) to require the Commissioner of Education to devise methods and promote plans for the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will go over.

HEIRSHIPS IN FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

The bill (S. 4151) to provide for a determination of heirship in cases of deceased members of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, conferring jurisdiction upon district courts to partition lands

belonging to full-blood heirs of allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, that bill relates to the question of titles in the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma and is asked for by the Farm Loan Bank at Wichita, Kans. It is a short bill, and I think there is no objection to it provided one or two amendments are made to it in order to remove what would be objections.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator if this is the bill that he was consulting with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] about?

Mr. OWEN. Yes; the Senator from Kansas and I have agreed upon the amendments to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. OWEN. On page 2 I move to strike out lines 2, 3, and 4, in the following words:

and when such proceedings have heretofore been conducted in compliance with the laws of said State then in force, the judgment and final order therein entered shall have like effect as of the date of its entry.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN. After the word "begun," in line 15 on page 2, I move to insert:

But this proviso shall not be construed to reopen the question of the determination of an heirship already ascertained by competent legal authority under existing laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRED H. GALLUP.

The bill (S. 3945) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Fred H. Gallup major of Field Artillery in the United States Army was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Fred H. Gallup, formerly a captain of Field Artillery, whose nomination as major of Field Artillery was confirmed by the Senate in June, 1916, a major of Field Artillery, to take rank at the foot of the list of majors of Field Artillery, and that no back pay or allowances shall accrue as a result of the passage of this act, and there shall be no increase in the total number of majors of Field Artillery now authorized by law by reason of the passage of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

The next business on the calendar was House concurrent resolution 39, to authorize the printing of 250,000 copies of the soldiers and sailors' civil relief act, approved March 8, 1918, etc.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will go over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (H. R. 8496) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, is obliged to be absent in attendance upon a very important meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and he requested me, as a member of the committee, in his absence to take charge of the pension bills on the calendar. I ask that this bill be taken up for action on the committee amendments.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of Barbara F. Hicks, widow of Francis M. Hicks, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Allie Hicks, helpless and dependent child of said Francis M. Hicks, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Barbara F. Hicks the name of said Allie Hicks shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Barbara F. Hicks.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 16, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Isaac D. Nichols, late of Company A, battalion, Forty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 24, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Sanders, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 3, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel H. Smith, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$24" and insert "\$21," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William H. Brenner, sr., late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 3, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$27," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James M. Birdwell, late of Company C, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 3, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Andrew P. Grubaugh, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Ervin, late of Company D, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$40," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Archibald W. Mayden, late of Company M, Sixteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 10, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Simeon Flory, late of Company C, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 16, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$40," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Josiah W. Lamb, late of Company I, Forty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 20, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$27," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Nathaniel H. Guthery, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Benjamin B. Cravens, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James W. Stine, late of Company F, Sixty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 19, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Upton J. Hammond, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 11, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Enos Pearce, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Charles W. Webster, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 22, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George W. Horton, late of Company B, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Nelson G. Mills, late of Company D, Seventieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Zedekiah Stapleton, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 14, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$24" and insert "\$21," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Edward Van Kleeck, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Morris Lincoln, late of Company K, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 16, before the word "Mounted," to insert "Volunteer," and in the same line, before the word "Infantry," to strike out "Volunteer," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James Layne, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Cyrus S. Lyon, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 20, before the word "Regiment," to strike out "Thirtieth" and insert "One hundred and eighty-eighth," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Hiram Eells, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Hiram Hineine, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Elizabeth Mathews, the widow of Dana Mathews, late of Company F, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel Shoup, late of Company K, One hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of John Waterhouse, late of Company E, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Miers B. Betts, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Myrenus Loomis, late of Company I, One hundred and second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 17, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Emanuel Mayberry, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 10, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$50," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Frederick J. Cressey, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and Company B, Seventeenth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 6, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$50," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George Young, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Isaac B. Robinson, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 23, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$27," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James N. Russell, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Thomas Phillips, late of Company G, One hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Samuel Cooper, late of Company D, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 19, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$40," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John E. Spilman, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Joseph C. Whittington, late of Smith's independent company, Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of Frances Watches, the widow of Allen Watches, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 12, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Edward Smith, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 3, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$40," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Horatio S. Howe, late of Company E, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$27," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Henry Brown, late of Company L, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 11, to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George F. Bennett, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Mary F. Russell, widow of Alfred W. Russell, late of Company F, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Abbie H. Lewis, widow of Henry A. Lewis, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-fourth Illinois Infantry, and Company E, Sixty-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of David K. W. Briggs, late of Company D, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$27," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Geuder, late of the band, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 17, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of August Dorman, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Robert Stevenson, late of Company F, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 46, to strike out:

The name of Charles S. Phelps, late of Company F, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Allen McKee, late of Company I, Third and Fifth Regiments Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Harriet J. Houghtaling, widow of Aaron Houghtaling, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. On page 25, at the bottom of the page, I move to strike out lines 23 and 24 and lines 1 and 2 on page 26, the beneficiary having died since the bill was reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 25, beginning on line 23, it is proposed to strike out the following:

The name of Charles G. Craig, late of Company H, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to ask the Senator having the bill in charge a question just for information. I notice that quite a number of the items which were passed by the House have been stricken out. Will the Senator kindly give briefly an explanation as to why they have been stricken out?

Mr. THOMPSON. As the Senator may know, these items are considered by subcommittees of the Committee on Pensions, and I have no personal knowledge of the reason any particular item was stricken out. They are all handled by a subcommittee, but I will say to the Senator I expect to ask for a conference with the House, and the conferees will adjust differences in amounts.

Mr. GRONNA. I assume, of course, that the reason why these items were stricken from the bill was because the beneficiaries have died since the bill passed the House. Is not that the reason in most cases?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is my information that the Senator from North Dakota is correct as to most of the items, but a few cases have been considered by the committee on their merit.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask the Senator having charge of the bill what the aggregate increase of pensions carried by the bill amounts to?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am unable to furnish that information because it has not been figured out or estimated.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose the same is true as to all of these bills? There has been no estimate of the increases?

Mr. THOMPSON. These are House bills.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that they are, and yet I suppose that the report of the House committee comes to the Senate.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no knowledge of any estimate having been made as to the exact amount. Of course, it could be ascertained in a short time. There is, however, a full explanation of each case in the committee report.

Mr. THOMAS. Presumably it is too small an item to have concerned the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Oh, no; but each individual case is considered by itself, and, of course, the Senator understands that when the cases are put in what is called an omnibus bill it has not been the custom to give the total increase.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The bill (H. R. 9160) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was announced as next in order.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I believe there ought to be more Senators in attendance when these matters are being passed on. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Asburt	Gulon	Myers	Simmons
Baird	Harding	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Brandegge	Henderson	New	Smith, Mich.
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Culbertson	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Sterling
Curtis	Kendrick	Page	Thomas
Fernald	Kirby	Phelan	Thompson
Fletcher	Lenroot	Polindexter	Tillman
France	Lewis	Ransdell	Trammell
Gallinger	McCumber	Saulsbury	Underwood
Goff	McNary	Shafroth	Wildley
Gronna	Martin	Sheppard	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] on account of death in his family.

I wish also to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] are absent on Red Cross work.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce the absence on official business of my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. MYERS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. WALSH] is detained on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained by illness. I wish also to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9160) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 2, line 2, after the word "Missouri," to strike out "Volunteer," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William Baynes, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 11, before the word "Infantry," to strike out "Volunteer," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lizzie Yorker, helpless and dependent child of Paul Yorker, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of Daniel Kelly, late of Company G, First Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William Gibson, late of Company C, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of George W. Mayden, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Joseph Quinn, late of Company F, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of William R. Hogue, late of Company G, Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Abbie P. Haskell, widow of Joshua Haskell, late of Company B, Twenty-fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 23, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel Mickey, late of Company K, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 9, to strike out:

The name of Silas J. Pickerill, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 3, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Joseph W. Santee, late of Company H, One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 12, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George Gunnell, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 24, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$27" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Joseph R. Moore, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John W. Barnett, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 13, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William Henderson, late of Company K, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 23, before the word "widow," to strike out "alleged," and on page 14, line 1, after the words "per month," to strike out: "Provided, That upon re-appearance of the husband and proof thereof, this pension shall cease and determine" and insert "such pension to cease upon proof that the soldier is still living," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Martha E. Gibbins, widow of Edward J. Gibbins, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, such pension to cease upon proof that the soldier is still living.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Hattie M. Dunsmoor, widow of James F. Dunsmoor, late of Company D, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Adelia Hamilton, former widow of Henry Mathews, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and Thirty-third Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 18, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Ruel Rounds, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Ellen M. Smith, widow of Emory B. Smith, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Margaret Steele, widow of Edward T. Steele, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment, Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Chauncey W. Young, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Canada D. Hicks, late of Company K, Forty-ninth Regiment Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Percival C. Bishop, late of Company I, One hundred and seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 17, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$40," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William A. Woods, late of Company E, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 2, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$27" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Joseph B. Sullivan, late of Company B, One hundred and fourth Regiment, and Company K, Thirty-fourth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Adaline Ballard, widow of Hiram Ballard, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of John C. Morgan, late of Company A, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Katherine W. Hauns, widow of Valerian Hauns, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James C. Weller, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of John R. Ogden, late of Company F, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to strike out: The name of George W. Hicks, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Sarah D. Bowman, widow of Henry Bowman, late of Company I, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25"; so as to make the clause read:

The name of William Harrier, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 25, before the word "late," to strike out "Cline" and insert "Kline," and on page 28, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John L. C. Kline, late of Company E, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Oliver P. Krutz, late of Company E, Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Valentine Fish, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Ellen Hawkes, late of the Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Mary A. Luther, former widow of Edwin Otis Evans, alias Edward Jones, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Ellen M. Cornell, widow of Joseph P. Cornell, late of the Signal Corps, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 19, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James Beyea, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. I move to strike out lines 19 to 22, on page 16, in the following words:

The name of Sargent Clark, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment, and Company I, Twelfth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The committee finds that this beneficiary has died since the bill was reported.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9506) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of George W. Rathman, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 1, after the word "month," to strike out "Pay to the duly appointed guardian," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Pearley Rex Harbert (insane), late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Theodore J. Kountz, late of Company G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to strike out:

The name of James F. Connell, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 12, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lory H. Powell, late of Troop H, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Mack Rittenberry, late of Company A, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 22, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Charles F. Russell, late of Company E, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of James E. Norman, late of Company A, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 9, after the words "Regular Establishment," to strike out "and Quartermaster's Department," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Charles D. Skirdin, late of Troop I, Fourth Regiment, and Troop I, Second Regiment, United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Fred O. Hamilton, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 9, to strike out:

The name of John Dowdy, late of Company G, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of Seaborn A. Frost, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Peter F. O'Brien, late of United States Navy, and Company M, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Stephen Hill, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of Richard Gurney, jr., late of Battery F, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 24, after the words "per month," to strike out "Pay to duly appointed guardian," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Charles V. Bradford, insane, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay to him a pension of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 7, to strike out:

The name of James A. Kelly, late of Company I, Forty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 23, before the words "late captain," to strike out "deceased"; in the same line, after the word "captain," to strike out "and commander"; and in line 24, after the words "United States Navy," to insert "retired," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Sally Speer Signor, widow of Matt Howland Signor, late captain United States Navy, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child, Eugenia, of the said Matt H. Signor, until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 13, to strike out:

The name of Herschel Spainhour, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, on page 14, I move to strike out lines 7, 8, and 9 of the bill, the proposed beneficiary having died since the bill was reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, after line 6, it is proposed to strike out:

The name of Joseph Whitney, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9612) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 8, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$27," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Blackburn, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Sarah E. Canton, widow of John Canton, late of Companies I and B, Eighty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 9, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and brevet brigadier general, United States Volunteers," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Adaline L. Black, widow of John C. Black, late colonel Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and brevet brigadier general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Norfleet, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$24" and insert "\$21," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James Smalley, late an unassigned drafted recruit, tenth congressional district of Indiana, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. On page 5, after line 5, I move to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, relative to John Burns, the beneficiary having died since the bill was reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, after line 5, it is proposed to strike out the following clause:

The name of John Burns, late of Company I, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 5, line 12, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$27" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Isaac C. Pierce, late of Company L, Third Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Georgeanna McNatt Mills, former widow of William J. McNatt, late of Company D, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 11, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$27," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Simeon C. Shields, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Eliza H. Cooley, former widow of Newton S. Parker, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 10, before the word "Regiment," to strike out "One hundred and forty-seventh" and insert "Forty-seventh," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John McKinney, late of Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 12, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John W. Rawley, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of David F. Pierce, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 24, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of David Hunter, jr., late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of George Saunders, alias "Sandy," late of Company A, First Regiment United States Colored Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Edward R. Chapin, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$27," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James Hagen, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 15, to strike out:

The name of Effie C. Strout, widow of Reuben Strout, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 22, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James Thomas, late of Company H, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Polly Kiff, former widow of Edson Murray, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 17, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Morton B. Flitts, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. On page 16, I move to strike out lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, the soldier therein referred to, Robert Hart, having died since the bill was reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, after line 18, it is proposed to strike out:

The name of Robert Hart, late of Company G, One hundred and first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 17, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Sarah E. Dieffenbacher, widow of James G. Dieffenbacher, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Arba H. Trufant, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 10, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Thomas C. Layton, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 23, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel H. McCartney, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 19, to strike out:

The name of Frances McCloe, widow of Edward S. McCloe, late of Company C, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$27," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Elijah Houghton, late of Company D, Eighty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 23, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$40," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George W. Littleton, late of Company F, Eighty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 19, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel A. Bennett, late of Battery B, First Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 21, before the word "Regiment," to strike out "Fourteenth" and insert "One hundred and forty-fifth," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Abraham G. Hendryx, late of Company A, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and Company I, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 12, after the words "New York," to insert "Veteran," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Annie Sangamo, widow of John Sangamo, late of Company M, Second Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 20, after the words "late of," to strike out "Company B, Forty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Enrolled Militia, and," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Catharine F. Reinart, widow of Franklin Reinart, late of Company H, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of William C. Tanner, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of James E. Merrifield, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to read:

The name of George M. Burns, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Emma L. Parker, former widow of William C. Parker, alias Charles Williams, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James H. Baker, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Gillon, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$24" and insert "\$21," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Albert Burgher, late of band, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 8, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James E. Upham, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 11, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William R. Tingley, late of Company A, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. On page 30 I move to strike out lines 13, 14, 15, and 16, the soldier named therein, James Longmire, having died since action on the bill by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 30, after line 12, it is proposed to strike out the following clause:

The name of James Longmire, late of Company A, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 31, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$40," so as to read:

The name of John W. Walker, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9641) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army

and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of James O. Carroll, late of Company K, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Jessie G. Frier, late of Company L, First Regiment Florida Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Michael P. Connaughton, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 16, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$24" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Sommers J. Love, late of the Seventh and Ninth Companies of the United States Volunteer Signal Corps, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of Charles A. Walters, late of Company G, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BONDS OF OFFICERS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS.

The bill (S. 3898) to require cashiers and other officers of a national banking association handling its funds to give bond and to prevent its officers and employees from making erasures on the books of the association was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the bills on the calendar, beginning with Order of Business No. 331 down to and including Order of Business No. 345, be passed over.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the measures referred to by the Senator from Utah have been on the calendar for a long time. I have attended the sessions of the Senate many times with a view to having them disposed of. I do not feel willing that those bills shall now be passed over. There are some of them that will excite discussion, and two or three—one being the bank guaranty act—I should be willing to have go over; but the first bill objected to, for instance, merely requires a bond of officers in banks and prohibits their striking out pages of the records of banks without leaving them clearly legible. There can be no possible objection to the passage of this bill. I think the Senator from Utah should be content to make his objection to bills to which there may be real objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Utah objects to the consideration of the bills extending on the calendar from Order of Business 331 to Order of Business 345.

Mr. OWEN. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 331, being Senate bill 3898.

Mr. SMOOT. We are working under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. OWEN. I did not understand that the Senate was proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senate is proceeding to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. OWEN. Then I shall object to all other bills—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me suggest—

Mr. OWEN. And I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senate adjourn. [Putting the question.]

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas seem to have it; the yeas have it, and the motion is lost.

Mr. OWEN. I call for a quorum.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	Martin	Sheppard
Baird	Henderson	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Johnson, Cal.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Caldor	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Smith, S. C.
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Smoot
Curtis	Kenyon	Overman	Swanson
Fernald	King	Owen	Thomas
Fletcher	Kirby	Page	Thompson
France	Lenroot	Phelan	Tillman
Gallinger	Lewis	Poindexter	Trammell
Gronna	Lodge	Ransdell	Wiley
Guion	McCumber	Robinson	
Hale	McKellar	Saulsbury	
Harding	McNary	Shafroth	

Mr. McNARY. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, a few moments ago, while the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] was unavoidably absent, the Senate passed the bill (H. R. 9612) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war. There is an item in that bill in which the Senator from Delaware is interested and which was stricken out. He desires to have the action of the Senate reconsidered in striking out that item. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the vote whereby House bill 9612 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered, so that the Senator from Delaware may present the item he has in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know what the item is which the Senator from Delaware has in mind, but I will say to him that, as the bill has passed, it will go to conference. I presume that he desires now to reinsert some item which was stricken out by the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SAULSBURY. That is precisely the case.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me tell the Senator why I will ask him not to make the request at this time. The Committee on Pensions which reported these bills recommended that certain items be stricken out because they did not fall within the rules adopted by the committee; and they have gone out. The House put them in perhaps under their rule, and if they have been put in under their rule, and are justifiable, then the Senate will recede from their amendments, but if we make an exception in the case of the amendment the Senator has in mind we will have to go through every one of the pension bills we have passed and change them in accordance with the action taken on the Senator's request, if the request is acted on favorably.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the Senator misunderstands the object of the request. This is the condition. If I may explain it: The House sent a bill here which contained a pension for a widow named Georgeanna McNatt Mills. The committee, under what they conceived to be a rule which they have adopted, struck that item from the bill. In the report on this bill it is stated that, according to the records of the War Department, the soldier whose widow is applying for a pension is a deserter. Personally, I knew that man, and I took the trouble to go to the State of Delaware and get a report from the adjutant general's office of the State, which shows that that man was enlisted for three years; was taken prisoner and confined in Richmond; was exchanged; was in the hospital time and time again; and was finally discharged before Petersburg at the end of his three years' enlistment.

One of the reasons given by the committee for its unfavorable report upon this item was that the man himself had never applied for a pension. As a matter of fact, which is stated to me by the Representative from Delaware, who lives in the same town where the widow lives and where the old man lived during his life, and, as I remember, the soldier was a very peculiar man in many ways. Among others, he disliked to have the idea suggested to him that he should apply for a pension, and he denounced every soldier who was not actually wounded in the war who applied for one. And here, by a report from a committee of this body in the case of a man who took the position that it was a man's duty to fight for his country and it was not the country's duty to support him forever afterwards because he had fought for it, his widow is refused a pension because that

is reason to suppose that he was a deserter, in connection with the absence of certain book entries in the War Department which some clerk may have neglected to make.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to say that I think that man ought to have as big a monument as the Government of the United States can possibly erect to his memory.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Absolutely; and it is an injustice to deny his widow a pension.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Colorado may change his mind on further consideration when he knows all the facts.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be, but the soldier's attitude is certainly most unique in these degenerate days.

Mr. SMOOT. It would be if that were the view taken by him, but I wish to call the Senator's attention to the facts.

Mr. THOMAS. I assume that what the Senator from Delaware has said is true.

Mr. SAULSBURY. And I am assuming that no one will accuse me of not saying what I believe to be true.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The man was a Union soldier; I knew him when I was a small boy, and knew that he was a very peculiar man; and I know that the Representative who lives in the very town where this man lived makes that statement to me. I have his record here from the adjutant general of the State and also as set forth in the history of the regiment, which was published by the chaplain of the regiment, as long ago, I think, as 1864 or 1865. It is as much a matter of justice to the memory of that man as anything else that I want this question fairly considered.

I was called from the chair for a moment; I have been in the Senate all day, but while I happened to be out for less than 10 minutes the bill was passed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the record of this soldier as shown by the War Department and to state why the committee refused to grant this pension.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I merely wish to inquire whether or not we are going to reconsider the measure.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to make a statement before action is taken on reconsidering the vote whereby the bill was passed.

William J. McNatt, late a private, Company D, First Regiment Delaware Infantry, who enlisted September 26, 1861, and whose name appears to have been carried on the rolls of the company to the date of mustering out of the organization, September 30, 1864, and while he was reported absent on account of sickness since October 18, 1863—

That is, he was absent for nearly a year—

no record of his discharge has ever been entered.

He claimed no pay from the Government during that whole time, and the only thing that the Government could do was to place upon the records that he was a deserter.

Mr. SAULSBURY. That has never been done. If the Senator will pardon me, he has never been characterized as a deserter.

Mr. SMOOT. The record so shows.

Mr. SAULSBURY. No; the record shows nothing to that effect.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us see what it shows. It says here:

No record of discharge has ever been entered. The records of the War Department show that he was captured at Snickers Gap October 27, 1862, and confined at Richmond, Va., November 4, 1862; paroled at City Point November 22, 1862; reported sick in convalescent camp December 31, 1863, being so carried on the records until August 31, 1864.

Then the letter from the War Department shows that the soldier was absent from the military control without authority from March 15, 1863, and there is no record of payment for service after that date.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I imagine this case is like a good many other cases of which I have knowledge. When the war was over it frequently happened that soldiers would go home without waiting to be mustered out. The man, I think, is not a deserter, but he was not mustered out.

Mr. SMOOT. The war was not over, I will say to the Senator, March 15, 1863.

Mr. NELSON. I understand that, but if the man had served his time out—

Mr. SMOOT. That was not the case, as the Senator would know if he had listened.

Mr. NELSON. The records in the adjutant general's office of the State show that he was not a deserter.

Mr. SMOOT. I am only telling the Senator what the records of the War Department show.

Mr. NELSON. I have known of a number of cases where the records of the department and of the adjutant general's office of the State entirely disagreed. I know in my own case I caused the records of the War Department to be corrected. I was wounded and taken prisoner at Port Hudson, but the War Department records did not show that fact. So I sent to the adjutant general of the State of Wisconsin and got a certified copy of the record and filed it with the department. After that record was filed they finally amended my record and allowed me commutation of rations at 25 cents a day while I was a prisoner of war.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am puzzled to know how a man could have left his command in the year 1863 and remained absent until some time in 1864, nearly a year, without having been arrested as a deserter.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether or not they could find him. Evidently they did not pay him anything, and he did not claim any pay.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have never known an instance of a soldier leaving his command for over a year during a time of war without being disturbed by the military authorities. It is a remarkable case.

Mr. SMOOT. I have known of many cases where the man who left was not apprehended at all.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SAULSBURY. If I may be permitted, I should like to state just what the conditions were as shown by the records of the War Department, by the records of the Treasury Department, and by the records of the adjutant general's office of the State. Then the Senator from Utah can find such fault with this man's record as he sees fit. The records of the War Department simply show that this man was taken prisoner, paroled, and then show him in the hospital and in convalescent camp; "on the roll of paroled prisoners at Annapolis, Md., to December 31, 1862. Not paid and no remarks."

The record proceeds:

On company roll from November 1, 1862, to February 28, 1863; remarks—not paid. "Captured at Snickers Gap." Last paid to June 30, 1862.

On company roll from March 1, 1863, to April 30, 1863; remarks—not paid. Absent in convalescent camp. Last paid to June 30, 1862.

On company roll from May 1 to June 30, 1863; remarks—not paid. Absent in convalescent camp.

On company roll from July 1 to August 31, 1863; remarks—not paid. Absent in convalescent camp. Last paid to June 30, 1862.

On company roll from September 1 to October 31, 1863; remarks—not paid. Absent in convalescent camp. Last paid to June 30, 1862.

On company roll from November 1, 1863, to February 29, 1864; remarks—not paid. Absent, sick in general hospital.

On company roll from March 1 to April 30, 1864; remarks—not paid. Absent, sick in hospital. Last paid, unknown.

On company roll from May 1 to August 31, 1864; remarks—not paid. Absent, sick in hospital. Last paid, —.

On det. muster-out roll of non. vets., dated September 30, 1864, his name is borne as William McNatt, with remarks—not paid. Absent, sick, since October 18, 1863. Last paid, unknown.

The record from the adjutant general's office of the State of Delaware is as follows:

Name, William J. McNatt. Private, age 18. Joined for service at Milford, Del. Enrolled by Capt. Smithers. Enlisted for three years. Mustered into service September 26, 1861, at Wilmington, Del., by Lieut. Derriekson. Remarks: Discharged September 30, 1864, before Petersburg, Va., expiration of term of service.

That is the official record of the adjutant general's office of the State of Delaware.

I have here in my hand a publication by the chaplain of the First Regiment of Delaware Volunteers. The imprint is 1866. It was written just after the war by the chaplain of that regiment, and the muster roll, as given, shows that William J. McNatt was a private who joined August 10, 1861, at Wilmington, Del., for three years, and his time expired.

It seems to me that the mere failure of some clerk in the War Department should not cause the blackening of the memory of a Union soldier who served his country, was captured, and had to go to the hospitals from time to time; and I am informed by the Congressman who lives in his very town that he was known to be a man who claimed the right to serve his country, as he did, by volunteering, and was absolutely opposed to anybody being paid pensions for simply doing their duty to the country.

That is the record of this man, and I think it is a very, very hard thing for the report of the committee to make such a record as it does for this man, after his death, when his widow is applying for a pension.

Those are the facts as I know them. I have given you my authority. I think this pension ought to be allowed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all I want to say is that the testimony that was before the committee, and upon which this report was based, shows that on October 18, 1863, this soldier was reported absent on account of sickness. His mustering-out time was September 30, 1864. During all that time there was no report made as to where he was. He did not claim any compensation whatever from that time until the time he died. He made no effort at all to have his record straightened. He never applied for a pension. It may have been upon the ground the Senator says; but, taking all of those things into consideration, the committee thought that a pension should not be granted to his widow, as this man's record was not complete in that he was considered a deserter.

It may be possible that he was not a deserter. Such a thing, I suppose, could happen, but it is not very probable; and I think that the records in the War Department ought to be straightened out if he was not a deserter. But when a man was absent from his company for 11 months, when he lived for years after the war, when he never asked for compensation during that 11-months' period, and never applied for a pension, it did seem to the committee that the records in a case of that kind ought to show positively whether or not he had deserted. Those are the facts in the case. If the Senate wants to reverse its action, well and good.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. How long did this man serve before he left the Army?

Mr. SMOOT. He was enlisted on September 26, 1861, and it was on October 18, 1863, that he was to have been mustered out. That is a little over two years.

Mr. McCUMBER. I just wish to suggest to the Senator from Utah, and also to the Senator from Delaware, that the general rule heretofore has been that before the Committee on Pensions would deal at all with the case of a man whose record, according to The Adjutant General's office, showed desertion he would first have to apply to have that record of desertion cleared up. That matter was settled by the Committee on Military Affairs, and, after the question of desertion had been tried out by the proper committee and a reinstatement made, then the bill for pensions would be proper before the Committee on Pensions.

I can not understand why in this particular instance a different course has been pursued.

Mr. SAULSBURY. This man's memory is a thing that probably amounts to more with his relations than the \$25 a month which his widow is to get. The idea of accusing a man of being a deserter because the records of the War Department show nothing about the matter except that he was captured fighting for his country, was in prison at Richmond, was paroled, and after that was in hospitals from time to time, showing that he probably was a man in broken health! When a history of the regiment, published in 1866, shows that man discharged, and when the records of the adjutant general of his State show that he was discharged before Petersburg, why, for the purpose of making good the omission of a mere clerk in the War Department, should we have an act of Congress passed?

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, as I understand the Senator, the department records do not show desertion at all?

Mr. SAULSBURY. By no means. They show that this man, so far as its records go, was absent, sick in a hospital or sick in a convalescent camp. He is not denominated as a deserter in the records of the War Department. That is a pure assumption, because the records do not show where he was at the time of his discharge. That is the only omission. This man is termed a deserter when the records of the War Department show nothing of the kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. I had understood from the discussion of the Senator from Utah, in which he used the term "deserter," that of course the records showed that he was a deserter.

Mr. SAULSBURY. There is absolutely no such evidence.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the records show that after October 18, 1863, the department knows nothing of him. He is not designated on the record as a deserter, because he was never apprehended after that time. There was no record at all after the report that was given on October 18, 1863. The day on which his organization was to be mustered out, the term for which he enlisted, was September 30, 1864, and they heard nothing of him between October 18, 1863, and September 30, 1864. The record closes there.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator this question: Under the Army rules, if there had been a desertion or if nothing had been heard from the man, if the officers knew nothing about where he was, was it not their duty to report him as a deserter?

Mr. SMOOT. I think so, Mr. President.

Mr. McCUMBER. And the fact that they did not report him as a deserter would be some evidence that they did not regard him as a deserter, would it not?

Mr. SMOOT. The Department did not even know where he was. He was never paid during that time.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Let me add this one bit of personal testimony: I know where this man was somewhere along about 1870, because I was born in the town where he lived, and, as a child, I remember a man known as William J. McNatt who was a Federal soldier. He was an old man to me at that time, of course. I knew that he was there, and my recollection is that he kept a little shop where we children used to buy things.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, he lived for a number of years after the war.

Mr. SAULSBURY. He lived at Georgetown, Del., all his life, and was a respected man in the community.

Mr. SMOOT. He did not die for years after the war, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I renew my motion to reconsider the votes by which House bill 9612 was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDERSON in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the item on page 6, lines 9 to 12, was stricken from the bill.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4103) to consolidate certain forest lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, and to add certain lands thereto was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (H. R. 10027) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 1, in line 8, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Alfred Cooper, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to read:

The name of George H. J. Little, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to read:

The name of John Reid, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 11, to strike out:

The name of Phoebe A. Jones, widow of Benjamin Jones, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 2, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Francis M. Kirkpatrick, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$24" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Henderson Morgan, late of Company D, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Almeda King, former widow of Robert E. Porter, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 23, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James M. Shuey, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John O. Harmon, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 24, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William J. Coleman, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 8, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of J. Comly Rich, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Edith King, widow of William J. King, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 24, before the word "widow," to insert "former," so as to read:

The name of Mary Lydick, former widow of Samuel A. Lydick, late of Company K, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Mary J. Titus, widow of Francis J. M. Titus, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 17, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Gustavus Odor, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Lattimore, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Ida E. Jones, widow of William A. T. Jones, late of Company E, Sixty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 17, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Frederick Von Dissen, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to read:

The name of Albert Cunningham, late of Company F, Second Battalion, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Alvin O. Thayer, late of Company K, Twenty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 13, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George S. Armstrong, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jonathan Bondy, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of John R. Bungard, late of Company E, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Annie L. Marksbury, widow of James W. Marksbury, late of Company G, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William W. Carson, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$27" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Anderson Bandy, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 13, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Robert S. McCreary, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Melissa C. Lewis, former widow of Eugene Risley, late of Company C, Twenty-fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 6, after the word "receiving," to insert "the same to be paid him without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged erroneous payments or overpayments of pensions," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel Smith, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, the same to be paid him without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged erroneous payments or overpayments of pension.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Gullford D. Taylor, late of Company C, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Matthew McGoldrick, late of Company H, Ninety-ninth Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The bill (H. R. 10477) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 1, in line 12, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Thomas C. Thodey, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Phebe Morgan, widow of John H. Morgan, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Alfred A. Gambill, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 12, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30" so as to make the clause read:

The name of Charles Nack, late of Company D, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, in line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to read:

The name of Michael C. Biering, late of Company I, Sixty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, in line 16, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William H. Snedaker, late of Company B, One hundred and seventy-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 14, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John T. McGown, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment, and Company G, Forty-ninth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Amanda L. Townsend, widow of Jacob Townsend, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 6, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Benjamin D. Cole, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Maggie A. Skinner, former widow of Zachariah D. Epperly, late of Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, in line 20, after the word "additional," to strike out "for each of two minor children of the soldier in lieu of that she is now receiving" and insert "on account of each of the minor children of said Adon Butler until they reach the age of 16 years, all such pension to be in lieu of that now being paid under certificate numbered 819840 on account of the soldier's minor children," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary R. Butler, widow of Adon Butler, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Adon Butler until they reach the age of 16 years, all such pension to be in lieu of that now being paid under certificate numbered 819840 on account of the soldier's minor children.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of Ellen M. Davenport, widow of John L. M. Davenport, late of Company K, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of John Short, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Albert N. Hopkins, late of regimental band, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Allen Farler, late of Company I, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Albert Wentink, late of Company K, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The resolution (S. Res. 229) to request the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred Senate joint resolution 145, to give said resolution early consideration and report to the Senate thereon, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1923) for the relief of John Doyle, alias John Geary, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3907) to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4426) to amend and reenact sections 5235 and 5236 of the Revised Statutes of the United States by providing for a guaranty fund for payment of certain deposits, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3529) to repeal the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National German-American Alliance," approved February 25, 1907, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that bill go over. The Senator from Idaho desires to be present when it is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (H. R. 10843) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Pensions, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of William L. Snider, late of Company I, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 14, before the word "late," to insert "junior," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Thomas J. Harris, Jr., late of Company C, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 23, before the word "late," to strike out "deceased," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Pauline A. Randt, dependent mother of John W. Randt, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to strike out:

The name of Andrew E. Youngner, late of the Thirteenth Recruit Company United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George H. McCauley, late of Company G, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to strike out:

The name of Howard A. Littlejohn, late of Heavy Battery, South Carolina Volunteer Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 10, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lemial S. Darr, late of Troop B, Eighth United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of John E. Root, late of Troop D, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 17, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Joseph Harris, late of Troop C, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John F. Smoot, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 13, to strike out:

The name of Walter L. Jewell, late of Troop B, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Howard P. Hare, late of the Eighteenth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Charles F. Schiller, late of Troop B, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Hulbert O. White, dependent father of Claude R. White, deceased, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Richard Thrash, late of Troop A, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 3, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Olaf H. Helele, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of James Manning, late of Company E, Forty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Christine Cook, dependent mother of Frederick H. Cook, deceased, late of Company L, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William C. Crockett, late of Company G, Second Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 14, to strike out:

The name of Mary Leahy, dependent mother of Cornelius J. Leahy, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 12, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mart Bradshaw, late of Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, as a new section, the following:

That the provisions of section 5 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1917, relating to intoxicating liquors in interstate commerce, be, and the same are hereby, made applicable to the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not any objections at all to the provisions of this amendment. I should be very glad to have it adopted; but I will say to the Senator that I hardly think it is proper to put it on a pension bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will state that this may be the only chance to get the measure through the Senate at this session.

Mr. SMOOT. There are more appropriation bills that it can be placed upon instead of putting it upon a pension bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not think it will injure the chances of the pension bill in any way. I trust the Senator will not object.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know how else to do, and I am going to ask the Senator to withdraw it and offer it as an amendment to some bill where it will be more appropriate than on this one.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I withdraw the amendment, Mr. President, and will offer the measure again at some later time.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3172) to provide for the abandonment of Piney Branch Road between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3438) to prevent corrupt practices in the election of Senators, Representatives, or Delegates in Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (H. R. 10850) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 3, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Isabella C. Waddell, late a nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 20, after the word "Eighteenth," to strike out "Regiment" and insert "Regiment," so as to make the clause read:

The name of David Lantz, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 25, after the word "Company," to insert the letter "D," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jacob Conkle, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Cavalry, and Company D, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 10, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel H. Samples, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 18, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William H. Eply, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George Houts, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. On page 8, lines 19 to 22, inclusive, I move to strike out the item, for the reason that the soldier has died.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, lines 19 to 22, it is proposed to strike out the following words:

The name of Myron I. Hartwell, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Henry H. Crane, late of Companies B and G, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. On page 9, I move to strike out lines 3 to 6, both inclusive, relative to Lucius A. West, he having died since the introduction of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 6, in the following words:

The name of Lucius A. West, late of Company M, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 15, to strike out:

The name of Samuel Gooding, late of Company F, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Elizabeth Shoeman, widow of David Shoeman, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 2, before the word "Regiment," to strike out "Tenth" and insert "Nineteenth," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Hezekiah S. Williams, alias Hezekiah Straw, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Horace W. Brown, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 20, before the word "Sollars," to strike out "Williams" and insert "William," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William Sollars, late of Companies A and D, Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 7, after the words "John Van," to strike out "Schoyk" and insert "Schoyek," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Van Schoyek, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 18, after the words "per month," to insert "in lieu of that she is now receiving," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lucretia Napier, dependent mother of Richard Napier, late of Company H, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Anna Branigan, widow of John J. Branigan, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment, and Company L, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 24, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Isaac L. Prescott, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 16, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James Powers, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment, and unassigned, Thirty-third Regiment, New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 1, before the word "widow," to insert "former," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Eva M. Bevier, former widow of James E. Bevier, late of Company H, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Mary A. Kiplinger, widow of Reuben D. Kiplinger, late of Company C, Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Chester E. Kyte, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 11, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Garrison J. Jaques, late of Company D, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Sarah L. Seltzer, widow of A. Frank Seltzer, late of Company G, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to read:

The name of Irving Holcomb, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Philo M. Russell, late of Company G, Twenty-eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 19, after the word "Company," to strike out "F" and insert "I," and in line 20, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and widow of Solomon Woggerman, late of Company C, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Rachel Woggerman, former widow of Daniel Lobaugh, late of Company I, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and widow of Solomon Woggerman, late of Company C, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 19, to strike out:

The name of Charles W. Cross, late of Company L, Third Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Mary E. Croasmun, widow of Oliver Croasmun, late of Company A, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Sabina Chaney, former widow of William J. Burcham, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 22, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$27" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William S. Kiddey, late of Company K, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Henry G. C. Rose, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and Thirty-seventh Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John P. Simonds, late of Company H, First Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The bill (H. R. 10924) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 3, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of John Groth, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Margaret C. Fargo, dependent mother of William H. Fargo, deceased, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to strike out:

The name of T. McElvany, late of Company C 2, Arkansas Veteran Infantry, and Company K, Thirty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

And insert:

The name of T. McElvany, late of Company C, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Thirty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 5, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Mary Diven, dependent mother of Edward T. Diven, junior, deceased, late of Company I, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The bill (H. R. 11364) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said wars was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 8, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Nathan L. Nims, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to strike out:

The name of Jacob Schofer, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment, and Company C, Second Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 8, after the words "per month," to strike out "Provided, That the pension heretofore granted Luzenia Brown shall not be affected by this act," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Sallie Blevins, helpless and dependent child of George Blevins, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Mary A. Ames, widow of Florian W. Ames, late of Company C, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Joseph K. Kelly, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 10, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jacob Barger, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Mary F. Church, widow of Milton Church, late of Company L, First Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of Margaret J. Rogers, former widow of George Musser, late of Company F, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of George Stoneking, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Eliza J. Fosha, divorced wife of George W. Fosha, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Fasnacht, late of Company K, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 24, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William J. Wyatt, late of Company F, One hundred and first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 24, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James M. Hummer, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Nancy E. Benedict, widow of Lafayette Benedict, late of Company C, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Margie A. Raines, former widow of William Mathews, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 24, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Richard C. Newsom, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 3, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$21," so as to make the clause read:

The name of David A. Gage, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Emma Chase, widow of Augustus L. Chase, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Daniel Keene, late of Company B, Sixty-seventh Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 19, to strike out:

The name of Annie Ridgway, widow of William Ridgway, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Hezekiah E. Hawver, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$27" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Milton T. Bedford, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lucian B. Walker, alias Burt Crowell, late of Company H, Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Henrietta Schmidt, former widow of Peter Eberle, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 11, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mathias Klingel, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William W. Agee, late of Company M, Third Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 2, after the word "determine," to strike out:

Provided further, That in the event of the death of Lettie Edie, the name of said Mary E. Edie shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Lettie Edie.

So as to make the clause read:

The name of Lettie Edie, widow of Arthur S. Edie, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Edie, helpless and dependent child of said Arthur S. Edie, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 10, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Martin T. Shadwick, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Joseph B. Doan, late of Company E, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 17, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Charles J. Mead, late of Company F, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Alonzo Green, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Etta C. Bartholomew, widow of William S. Bartholomew, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 12, after the word "determine," to strike out:

Provided further, That in the event of the death of Sedonia A. Smedley the name of said Lemuel T. Smedley shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Sedonia A. Smedley.

So as to make the clause read:

The name of Sedonia A. Smedley, widow of Henry A. Smedley, late of Company L, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Lemuel T. Smedley, helpless and dependent child of said Henry A. Smedley, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 3, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel P. Thurber, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Charles H. Williams, late of Company F, Fifty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 11, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Benjamin F. Smith, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FOREST LANDS IN ARIZONA.

The bill (S. 3914) authorizing a right of way for the transportation of water for improvement of grazing and development of the live-stock industry upon public and national forest lands in Arizona was announced as next in order.

Mr. LENROOT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

NATIONAL GUARD OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (S. 3735) to provide for enlistments in the National Guard of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been read heretofore, and, unless requested, the reading will be dispensed with. One amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs has been agreed to. The other amendments will be stated.

The remaining amendments were, on page 2, line 6, to strike out "the" and insert "this"; and, on the same page, line 25, to strike out the words "except as hereinafter provided," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the present war enlistments in the National Guard of the District of Columbia and appointment of officers in said National Guard shall be made from men who, upon examination, are found to be physically and mentally fit for military service, and within such age limits as may be prescribed by the commanding general of the District of Columbia Militia, with the approval of the President of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the joining of the National Guard of the District of Columbia, under the provisions of this act by anyone either as an officer or an enlisted man, shall not relieve him from liability for any service in the United States military or naval forces to which he would otherwise be subject: *And provided further*, That enlistments under the provisions of this act shall not prevent the continuance of enlistments, during the period of the war, of such men in the National Guard of the District of Columbia who may so elect, under the requirements of six-year contract of enlistment as heretofore prescribed: *And provided further*, That enlistments in the National Guard of the District of Columbia of the special class, and

appointments of officers as herein specially provided, shall be for the period of the war and for a period not exceeding three months thereafter, if such additional term of service be required by the President of the United States, and, further, for service within the District of Columbia, or in cases of emergency, in the adjoining States of Maryland and Virginia, and such officers and enlisted men when in service, shall receive the same pay and allowances as are now provided by law for the National Guard of the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That all officers appointed under the provisions of this act shall be commissioned by the President of the United States, on the recommendation of the commanding general of the District of Columbia Militia, and no officer shall be commissioned without first being subject to an examination to determine his fitness to hold commission: *And provided further*, That during the period of the war retired officers of the National Guard of the District of Columbia may, if they so request, be assigned to duty as officers of the District of Columbia National Guard, in such grades as the President may direct, subject to examination: *And provided further*, That officers who have served in the National Guard and have resigned therefrom and officers and enlisted men who have been honorably discharged shall, during the period of the war, be eligible to reappointment and commission in the National Guard of the District of Columbia in such grades as they may be found qualified by examination to fill.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (S. 4542) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to pension the persons named at the rates given:

John B. Chandler, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, \$12 per month.

John Barker, late of Company D, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rolla King, late of Battery E, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, \$12 per month.

John B. Raines, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, \$12 per month.

John W. Ferris, late chaplain, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12 per month.

Emmett L. Warren, alias Alanson Warren, late of Captain L. Buoy's Company B, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Roswell B. Van Wagenen, late of Company E, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Fitzgerald, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, \$12 per month.

Green B. Riggs, late of Captain J. Williams's Company N, Second Regiment Washington Territory Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Barnard J. Irwin, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Laura A. Workman, widow of Eddy J. Workman, late of Battery I, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Eddy J. Workman until they reach the age of 16 years.

George R. Hamilton, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, \$12 per month.

Orval W. Hiatt, late of Company E, Fortieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$20.

Charles R. Walters, late of Troop D, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Agnes Swarts, widow of John L. Swarts, late of U. S. S. *Independence*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, \$17 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said John L. Swarts until they reach the age of 16 years.

Mary Howard, widow of George Howard, late of Battery M, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Berlie Cross, late of the Fifty-first Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Willis Hood, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, \$12 per month.

John L. Daries, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James F. Byard, late of Company H, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ada Johnston Cowles, widow of Walter Cleveland Cowles, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, \$50 per month.

Florence M. Anderson, widow of James L. Anderson, late captain Company L, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$25 per month.

Fred Boyd, late of Company F, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12.

Ellen H. Sharp, widow of Frederick D. Sharp, late captain, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, \$25 per month.

George W. Goodman, late of Capt. Robert Porter's company California Volunteers, California Indian war, \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward Jordan, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12 per month.

Lanson O. Brown, late of Company H, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12 per month.

Louis H. Roberts, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$30 per month.

Persis M. McKee, widow of Thomas McKee, late of Capt. Alfred's company, Nauvoo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian war, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary P. McIntire, former widow of William B. Skinner, late of Company I, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Feracane Paolo, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louis N. Mallet, late of Company I, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$30 per month.

David M. Thompson, late of Company E, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain \$20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill (S. 4543) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to pension at the rates given the following persons:

Emma C. Hill, widow of Nathan S. Hill, late captain Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Robert Kinkead, late of Company G, Two hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Chase Cummins, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel W. Bartlett, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment, and Company B, Tenth Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Luke P. Brooks, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William A. Cale, late of Company K, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joshua C. Ogden, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel W. Welsh, late captain Company B, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaac Boyce, late of Company D, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Littleton T. Morgan, late of Company B, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Aaron M. Elliott, late of Company G, Seventy-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Patty, late of Company K, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rufus Mapes, late of Company I, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William G. Simpson, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John D. Brooks, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-first Regiment, and Company F, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Perrine, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jacob A. Kenoyer, late of Company C, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Orin Tucker, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jonas H. Evans, late of Company H, One hundred and third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lewis Norman, late of Company E, Seventy-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry C. Rowley, late of Company B, Fiftieth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew F. Maxwell, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Payton S. Lynn, late of Company F, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel Lowery, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert P. Leavitt, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles W. Lathrop, late of Company E, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas J. Stanfield, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William M. Wright, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew J. Wright, late of Company A, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edgar A. Kesler, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jahiel Bowers, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lewis Atkinson, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John T. Criswell, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William A. Kilton, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Fourth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Asa D. Whitmore, late of Battery E, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James M. King, late of Company K, Twenty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Zed Culver, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James H. Knight, late hospital steward, Twenty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, assistant surgeon, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Reiman, late of U. S. S. *Arcturion*, United States Navy, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James B. Atkinson, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Francis Mayhew, late of Company A, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Anton Lawrence, late of Company F, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William N. Webb, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Melinda A. Smiley, widow of Sylvanus C. Smiley, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month.

Dora Broom, helpless and dependent daughter of James W. Broom, late of Company F, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Zadok M. McCleary, late of Company F, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hosea Butterfield, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William T. Eustis, late first lieutenant and adjutant, Fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Galbraith, late unassigned, Brackett's Battalion Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah Ann Ross, widow of Samuel B. Ross, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month.

Jacob Witmer, late of Company E, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John J. Houswerth, late of Company H, Two hundred and eighth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Theodore W. Davis, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Seymour A. Stearns, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John L. Harvey, late of Company E, Sixty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jonathan Dellinger, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thompson M. Hollabaugh, helpless and dependent son of John Hollabaugh, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

George Blake, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment, and Company C, Thirty-first Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Phebe Bushee, widow of Moses Bushee, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month.

Charles H. Whiteley, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert Young, late of Company H, Two hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louisa Simon, widow of Jacob Simon, late of Company K, Ninety-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$25.

Daniel Duncan, late of Company G, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Wood, late of Company G, one hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Butler, late of Company I, One Hundred and ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Beahen, late of Company B, Veteran Battalion, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Regiments Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles W. Cross, late captain Company F, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles M. Colby, late of Company E, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Sharpshooters, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel W. Presley, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph E. Gammon, late of Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and unassigned, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Grauville Fernald, late captain Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Oliver P. Chambers, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elizabeth Cole, widow of Samuel C. Cole, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$25 per month.

William H. Morgan, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Cyrus Wood, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David A. Sawyers, late of Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and hospital steward, United States Army, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George McDowell, late of Company H, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas Higgins, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William P. Hodsdon, late commissary sergeant, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew J. Martin, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles J. Higgins, late of Company C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and Eighty-first Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaiah Hutchison, late of Company C, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George A. Gardner, late of Company G, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Vincent, late of Company H, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jacob W. Kinsey, late of Company H, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frederick E. Sprague, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Levi R. Gray, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ellison Gilbert, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James N. Harris, late of Company C, Sixty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Warren M. Easton, late of Company E, Eighty-ninth Regiment, and Company H, Fifty-ninth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John F. Loehr, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Josiah Weaver, late of Company E, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alonzo L. Whitcomb, late of Company F, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, Thirty-third Regi-

ment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward Shattuck, late of Company F, Eighteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward Foster, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Adaling D. Norris, widow of Wesley W. Norris, late lieutenant colonel Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Cecilia Hall, widow of Robert M. Hall, late colonel Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and brevet brigadier general United States Volunteers, \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Thomas J. Vinyard, late of Company G, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Strouse, late of Company D, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew Nelson, late of Company F, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Martin B. Fitch, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Childs, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$21 per month.

Beckwith A. McNemar, late of Companies M and O, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Janet H. Morrison, widow of William Morrison, late of Company G, Seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month.

Austin D. Bates, late second lieutenant Company F, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel B. Grant, late of Company I, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alvin Jones, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Martha L. Cutler, widow of John H. Cutler, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, \$25 per month.

Thomas Ewing, late of Company F, Third Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Gard, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frank Baker, late of Company G, One hundred and eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John C. Carlin, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John S. Ranlett, late of the U. S. S. *Florida*, United States Navy, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William K. Annis, jr., late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sabra J. Swisher, former widow of Alexander Swisher, late of Company E, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month.

William H. Dixon, late unassigned, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment, and Company A, Ninth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Pulver Kline, late of Company D, Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Tenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Wilson S. Richards, late of Company E, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William L. Heiskell, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas J. Locey, late of Companies D and E, Fifteenth Regiment, and Company L, Tenth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah E. White, former widow of Charles H. Crossman, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and widow of Joseph H. White, late of Company F, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$25 per month.

Monroe Eddy, late of Company H, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Cyrus B. Norris, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles A. Nimocks, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jonathan Paulus, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Zachariah Blake, late of Company B, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ellen Lee Scantling, widow of John C. Scantling, late major One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and lieutenant colonel United States Army, retired, \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John H. Scott, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Levi H. Miller, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William C. Roose, late acting third assistant engineer, United States Navy, \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry J. Lane, late of Company G, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Morgan, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joshua Boreing, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. L. Nesbitt, late of Company E, Forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Hill, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alexander P. Settle, late of Company A, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel W. Scoggins, late second lieutenant Company B, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louisa M. Ferrier, now Wright, former widow of Jacob Ferrier, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month.

James W. Elwell, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph T. Lewis, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John M. Safford, late of Companies L and C, and commissary sergeant First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles A. Lauman, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment, and Company K, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Sixteenth Regiment, and Companies F and H, Thirty-fourth Regiment, United States Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Victoria A. Amberg, former widow of George R. Anderson, late of Company K, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, \$25.

Permella L. Dutcher, widow of John Dutcher, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment Missouri Enrolled Militia, \$25 per month.

Mr. THOMPSON. On page 25, I move to strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the following words:

The name of Joseph T. Lewis, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This is a duplicate of the item that has been taken care of in House bill 7634, which has already been passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION.

The next business on the calendar was Senate resolution 241 directing the Committee on Military Affairs to inquire into and report to the Senate the progress of aircraft production in the United States.

Mr. LEWIS. That by understanding—the Senator from Kansas will probably justify my understanding—goes over until to-morrow. Am I right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (H. R. 11658) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 4, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of John McMahon, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Wilbur S. Chapman, late of Company H, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 9, to strike out:

The name of John Hammons, late of Company C, Second West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Troop A, First Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of Clarence L. Wimer, late of Company A, Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of John W. Hamilton, late of Company B, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Freda Burow, widow of William M. Burow, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 10, to strike out:

The name of James Green, late of the Thirty-first Company United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Margaret A. McAdoo, widow of Austin McAdoo, late of Company B, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Oliver P. Jackson, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Elmer D. Hopper, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 2, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary F. Kenaday, widow of Elias J. Kenaday, late of Capt. Morgan's company, Iowa Mounted Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 3, to strike out:

The name of Mary C. Shell, dependent mother of Willis A. Shell, late of Company M, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of John M. Hall, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Dallas Mills, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Amanda Foster, widow of William Foster, late of Company E, District of Columbia and Maryland Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 5, before the word "Cavalry," to strike out "Volunteer," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William D. Harris, late of Troop I, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The bill (H. R. 11663) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 8, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Silas D. Taylor, late of Company E, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 11, after the word "Battalion," to strike out "Fourteen" and insert "Fourteenth Regiment," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Joseph K. Dixon, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment, and Company D, Battalion Fourteenth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 15, to strike out:

The name Serelda Pargin, widow of David Pargin, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 25, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James West, late of Company A, One hundred and eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John W. Amos, late of Company H, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$21," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John W. Ramsen, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$18," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Charles W. Brace, late of Company F, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 19, after the words "Home Guards," to insert "and widow of Charles A. Vining, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Sarah E. Vining, former widow of Jacob James, late of Company F, Osage County Missouri Home Guards, and widow of Charles A. Vining, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jonas Bratton, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 18, to strike out:

The name of Sarah C. Haggard, widow of William Grant, alias William Grant Haggard, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 23, after the words "late of," to strike out "unattached" and insert "Seventeenth Unattached Company," and, in line 25, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of William Richardson, late of Seventeenth Unattached Company, Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Harrison Ruark, late of Company A, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Abraham Mott, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Hanson Harmon, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 14, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Irwin Jordan, late of Company F, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 18, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Richard G. Paynter, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Charlotte Heald, former widow of Willard E. Converse, late of Company G, Thirty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 6, to strike out:

The name of Ellen E. Greenfield, widow of William A. Greenfield, late of Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$29 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of either or both of said minor children of said William A. Greenfield the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Ellen E. Greenfield the names of said Marguerite A. and Wilma A. Greenfield shall be placed on the

pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws from and after the date of the death of said Ellen E. Greenfield, as provided by the law under which now pensioned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Jarrett, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jeremiah Hunt, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 1, after the words "Reserve Corps," to insert "Missouri Home Guards," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Eva Muller, widow of Peter Muller (alias Miller), late of Company H, First Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Home Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 3, after the words "Doctor William," to strike out "Warner" and insert "Warren," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Doctor William Warren, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Henry Stone, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and widow of Jacob Landsittel, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Calla R. Landsittel, former widow of George Long, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and widow of Jacob Landsittel, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of Presley Jackson, late of Company F, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 13, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George Snow, late of Company E, Two hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John S. Wray, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment, and Company A, Sixtieth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Joseph Holmes, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 17, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James McCommon, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James A. Brown, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36," and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of James W. Calkins, late of Company M, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 23, to strike out:

The name of Mary J. McGuire, widow of Columbus M. McGuire, late of Company H, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$36" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Amara J. Bachelder, late of Company I, Thirtieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 10, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John McGill, late of Company A, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 18, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$36," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Charles Plummer, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 22, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John Heblanthal, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 1, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$30" and insert "\$25," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Augustus Brown, late of Company A, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 14, to strike out:

The name of Mary E. Livingston, widow of Sherman Livingston, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 19, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Irvin Howard, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. On page 7 I move to strike out lines 4, 5, 6, and 7 in the following words:

The name of John H. Maxwell, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This beneficiary is reported dead, and hence I move the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES IN ILLINOIS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There was a bill objected to—

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the Senator yield to me that the amendments of the House to a Senate bill may be laid before the Senate and a conference appointed?

Mr. LEWIS. The calendar is not finished. I have a bill on the calendar not yet reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a remaining bill on the calendar. It will be stated.

The bill (S. 2654) providing for the appointment of two additional district judges in the State of Illinois was announced as the last bill on the calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint two additional district judges for the northern judicial district of the State of Illinois, each of whom shall possess the same qualifications and have the same powers and jurisdiction as now prescribed by law in respect to the present judges for that district.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the appointment of two additional district judges in the northern district of the State of Illinois."

JOHN DOYLE, ALIAS JOHN GEARY.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Objection was made to the bill (S. 1923) for the relief of John Doyle, alias John Geary, by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. He is willing to withdraw his objection, and I ask for its consideration. It is the same bill I referred to on yesterday.

Mr. SMOOT. My colleague [Mr. KING] objected to the bill yesterday.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; and I have seen the Senator's colleague, and he wants me to call it up and proceed with it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I have no objection.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and the laws conferring rights and privileges upon honorably discharged soldiers of the Volunteer Army, their widows and dependent children, John Doyle, alias John Geary, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private, Company C, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, on the 10th day of January, 1863: *Provided,* That no back pension, pay, bounty, or other emolument shall be paid prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7634) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. THOMPSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. HOLLIS, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has a matter that he desires now to bring to the attention of the Senate, and therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMOOT. No; he does not want to bring it up this evening.

Mr. THOMAS. I withdraw the suggestion I made.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to submit a request for unanimous consent that the naval appropriation bill, which was reported to-day, be made the unfinished business, and then it is my purpose to ask for a recess and commence the consideration of it promptly at 12 o'clock to-morrow. Possibly we may be able to dispose of it to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is not in the Chamber. Yesterday just before adjournment it was tacitly understood, at least by the Senators present, that Senate resolution 241 would be called up to-morrow morning. I would dislike to give consent to the request of the Senator from Virginia, and therefore I shall have to object to making the naval appropriation bill the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 22, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 21, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, God our Father, never far from us, we would draw near to Thee in the present world crisis and receive wisdom, strength, courage, fortitude, that we may meet the exigencies of the hour and prove ourselves worthy of the great gifts bestowed upon us as a free people—lovers of liberty, truth, justice, and equal rights for all mankind.

We thank Thee for the wave of patriotism sweeping through our land, which searches the heart and inspires men to heroic deeds.

We thank Thee that the young men have responded to the call of the colors, and we bless Thee for the spirit which lives in the hearts of men, illustrated in the Red Cross, the embodiment of all that is purest and best in man; a moral and spiritual force behind the men behind the guns, carrying succor, courage, fortitude to them, and deft hands, guided by warm hearts, to bind up their wounds and inspire them to hope; giving courage and comfort to those who are passing from time to eternity; reaching out the helping hand to all the sorrowing and misery-suffering people, caused by an implacable foe, who would stop the wheels of progress and turn back the tide of civilization.

The call is imperative, the needs are wide reaching; grant that every man, woman, and child shall give of their substance, that it may go forward in the humane work without hindrance.

God bless the Red Cross; uphold, sustain, and guide it; and God grant that we may all stand behind it in prayers and in money, until a righteous peace shall be established throughout the world; that right may live and wrong perish, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon the subject of the zone postal rates.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the zone postal rates. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, does that include the gentleman's own remarks only?

Mr. RANDALL. Nothing but my own remarks, and they are very brief.

Mr. WALSH. None of these resolutions?

Mr. RANDALL. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 954. An act to amend an act approved June 22, 1910, entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands";

S. 3663. An act authorizing the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians residing in the State of Washington to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

S. 3943. An act to provide for the disposition of public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the reclamation laws and which are no longer needed in connection with said laws;

S. 3923. An act authorizing the Indian tribes and individual Indians, or any of them, residing in the State of Washington and west of the summit of the Cascade Mountains to submit to the Court of Claims certain claims growing out of treaties and otherwise;

S. 280. An act for the relief of Alfred Sjoström;

S. 304. An act for the relief of Peter McKay;

S. 1090. An act for the relief of the Alaska Steamship Co.;

S. 57. An act for the relief of Kate Canniff;

S. 1804. An act for the relief of George T. Hamilton;

S. 924. An act for the relief of Delliiah Siebenaler;

S. 4023. An act amending an act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Cal., certain public lands in California; and granting rights in, over, and through the Sierra Forest Reserve, the Santa Barbara Forest Reserve, and the San Gabriel Timberland Reserve, Cal., to the city of Los Angeles, Cal.," approved June 30, 1906;

S. 3124. An act for the relief of Francis M. Atherton;

S. 4451. An act to provide for allowances for and minimum pay of Army field clerks, to provide for increased pay to Army field clerks for service beyond the continental limits of the United States, and to provide quarters or commutation thereof to Army field clerks in certain cases;

S. 3002. An act for the relief of the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co.;

S. 3566. An act authorizing the President to appoint Second Lieut. Ansel G. Wineman as a provisional second lieutenant in the Regular Army;

S. 2205. An act for the relief of Isaac J. Reese;

S. 4428. An act to amend section 272 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909;

S. 4365. An act to authorize the President to make provision for the care and treatment of persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States who are citizens of any nation at war with a nation with which the United States is at war;

S. 2704. An act for the acquisition of additional land at the Leon Springs Military Reservation, Tex.;

S. 4498. An act to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917;

S. 72. An act concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 1879. An act for the relief of John C. Hesse;

S. 4423. An act relating to the deposit of copyrighted books upon medical and allied subjects;

S. 3572. An act authorizing the Coos Bay, Umpqua, and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians in the State of Oregon to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution for the appointment of three members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes that George H. Wood, of Ohio; James S. Catherwood, of Illinois; and John C. Nelson, of Indiana, be appointed members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of the United States, to succeed George H. Wood, of Ohio; James S. Catherwood, of Illinois; and John C. Nelson, of Indiana, whose terms of office expired April 21, 1918; and

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance by members of the military or naval forces of the United States of decorations from the government of any of the countries concurrently engaged with the United States in the prosecution of the present war and the issuance by the United States of decorations to members of the military and naval forces of said countries.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 5558) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 4910) to authorize the establishment of a town site on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

An act (S. 390) to establish the Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

FOOD PRODUCTION.

The SPEAKER. The House will automatically resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11945, relating to food production.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Second. For procuring, storing, and furnishing seeds, as authorized by section 3 of the act, the appropriations for said purposes of \$2,500,000 in section 8 of the act and \$4,000,000 under the heading "Department of Agriculture" in the act approved March 28, 1918, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, shall be available until the date when said act of August 10, 1917, shall cease to be in effect, and any moneys heretofore or hereafter received by the United States for furnishing such seeds may be used as a revolving fund until said date.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When the urgent deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration in the Committee on Appropriations representatives of the Department of Agriculture came before the committee and urged the pressing need for an additional appropriation of \$4,000,000, which was granted them in that act. I have not had time to examine the hearings of the committee on this pending bill, and I wish to ask for information as to what was disclosed in the expenditure of that additional sum of \$4,000,000, which is by this paragraph continued in effect. The hearings then disclosed, as I recall, that two million and a half dollars which had been appropriated in the original food-supply bill was to be utilized largely in Texas and in the Northwest. There were certain districts of the country, like Indiana, where there was need for supplying seed by reasons of drought or failure of crops, but the department did not have the time and did not have the money to supply that need. I am seeking information as to whether this \$4,000,000 was available for other parts of the country than those in which the original sum was utilized.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes; it was utilized in other sections of the country. As the gentleman states, some of this appropriation was expended in Texas and in North Dakota and South Dakota and through the drought-stricken regions. Subsequent to that, under the appropriation made by the Committee on Appropriations, the other sections of the country were taken up wherever the need was shown, and the money applied in those sections, going into the corn belt and even as far as New York State. In some remarks the other day I mentioned the exact States in which it had been expended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give us any information, as disclosed in the hearings, as to what the prospect is for want of seed by reason of shortage of crops during the coming year?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. All the hearings we had in reference to this matter—and they were quite extensive at different times, because there were hearings on special bills as well as the appropriation bill—showed there was great necessity for looking after the furnishing of seed through various sections of the country, and the demand was very great indeed. Of course this fund provided for in this bill will be more in the nature of an insurance fund, so that these emergencies may be met as they arise. If they do not arise, of course the money will not be expended.

Mr. STAFFORD. I heard it stated in private conversation on the floor of the House here by a gentleman who is not now present that an estimator of the wheat crop predicted that the supply for the coming year from the present outlook would be several hundred million bushels more than the crop of last year. Was there anything in the hearings to justify the committee in coming to that conclusion?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The estimate showed that there would be an increase in the production of wheat this year, and we shall in all probability make the very largest wheat crop ever made in the United States. So far as the crop is concerned at the present time the conditions are very encouraging. General conditions in reference to the crop are much better than they were last year. I think there is no question but that there will be an increased production of wheat.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The effect of this paragraph is not to make any new appropriation.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Not a cent.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman said that a great deal of this seed probably would be used in cases of emergency, and that unless the emergency arose the money would not be expended for the purchase of the seed. Is that correct?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That is true. By emergencies I mean, of course, where it develops in any part of the country that there is necessity to look after the furnishing of seed. The money would not be expended unless this demand should arise. That may arise and come to the attention of the department, and then the department will take cognizance of the facts furnished them and make such an investigation as is necessary, and if it is shown that the necessity does exist then seed will be secured and the people will be notified where they are and where they can be obtained, and if large quantities are demanded of

course the Government will get them and transfer them to those localities and store them and sell them at cost.

Mr. WALSH. What will be the necessity of storing in large quantities of seed if that is the plan of the department?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Of course, seed would not be stored any great length of time, but it would be necessary to secure some place to take care of them until they were distributed out to individual farmers.

Mr. WALSH. Now, the gentleman has stated the outlook for the coming wheat crop is excellent, as I understand him, and the general conditions are better than they were last year.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Very much better.

Mr. WALSH. And we will probably have a bumper crop of wheat this fall or whenever it is harvested?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It is estimated there will be a considerable increase over last year.

Mr. WALSH. Now, that result has been obtained without the utilization of this somewhat modest appropriation which was carried in the bill which passed this House for the purchase of seed wheat to be sown this year—the bill which passed early in the session. We have got this big crop coming, if nature will be kind, without the utilization of that somewhat modest sum of money we appropriated in that bill.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I presume the gentleman refers to the bill which passed the House and is now pending in the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. It is pending somewhere, I assume.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. In the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is up in the air.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The emergency provided for by that bill having passed, possibly and probably that bill will not be passed.

Mr. WALSH. So the wheat crop is absolutely safe, and there will be no need of worrying about it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. About that appropriation?

Mr. WALSH. No; without it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. When hearings were had on this additional appropriation before the Committee on Appropriations all of the two and a half million dollars of this revolving fund had been spent, but no money, as I recall, had been received from the farmers in payment of these seeds. Can the gentleman from Mississippi in charge of the bill inform the committee whether any amount of this large fund has been returned so as to recoup the fund that was paid out by the department agents?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. My information is the Government has not lost anything by the sale of seeds.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not lost anything, but whether any of the money for the seeds furnished has been returned to the fund.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. As fast as cash is received by the department from the sale of seeds it goes back into the Treasury. The amount collected from the sale of seed up to the present time, my information is, has been returned to the Treasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not give the committee any information as to the total amount of seed of various kinds that has been purchased under this authorization from the department?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I stated that the other day. I will, in my speech, be glad to furnish the information again to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is in the Record, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I stated that the other day in detail exactly the kind and quantity of seed, and it will appear in the Record.

The Clerk read as follows:

Third. For the prevention, control, and eradication of insects and plant diseases injurious to agriculture, and the conservation and utilization of plant products, \$811,300.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUTCHINSON: Page 2, line 23, after the word "products," insert: "for the following stated purposes and in amounts as follows: Cereal-smut eradication, \$110,000; peanut conservation and utilization, \$15,000; control of cotton, truck, and forage crop diseases, \$117,550; farm storage of sweet potatoes, \$30,000; location of Irish potato seed stocks, \$30,000; plant-disease survey, \$23,000; castor-bean production and utilization, \$20,000; maintenance of field-bean seed supply, \$10,000; field supervision of war-garden work, \$7,500; production of cereals and grain sorghums, \$53,250; sugar-beet nematode work, \$10,000; inspection of fruits during processes of marketing,

\$18,000; control of new sugar-cane disease, \$20,000; production of rice, \$5,000; control of cereal and forage insects, \$55,000; control of stored-product insects, \$22,000; control of vegetable and truck crop insects, \$35,000; control of sweet-potato weevil, \$30,000; control of deciduous-fruit insects, \$45,000; control of citrus-fruit insects, \$10,000; control of insects injurious to live stock, \$20,000; control of rice insects, \$3,000; control of sugar-cane insects, \$9,000; general supervision of emergency insect-control work, \$3,000; prevention of plant-dust explosions and fires, \$75,000; total, \$776,300; and strike out the figures "\$811,300."

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the House, and I ask that the gentleman make the point of order.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will, then, ask the gentleman a question. Is this a similar amendment to the one offered by the gentleman yesterday?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. It is similar in that it is itemized, but makes it \$35,000 more, owing to an error of somebody in drawing the bill.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This is in identically the same form as the amendment offered by the gentleman to the first paragraph upon which the chairman ruled yesterday and held it to be in order.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. It is.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Then I do not insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, the committee made three reductions. First, the control of cotton, truck, and forest crop disease, \$20,000; second, control of sweet-potato weevil, \$20,000; third, in the Bureau of Chemistry, markets and plants, \$60,000, making a total of \$100,000.

The amount as submitted in the section is \$811,300. The total estimate was \$876,300, making a difference of \$65,000. My amendment makes the amount just \$100,000 less. So there is an error in the section before us of \$35,000. While this does not seem a very great amount, especially if you are going to give carte blanche to the Secretary of Agriculture to use it for any one item, I could discuss several of the items in this amendment, but I am only going to say a few words about one, and that is the general supervision of the prevention of plant-dust explosions and fires. When that was before the committee it was divided into three sections—first, for the prevention of thrasher explosions and fires, and, second, for the prevention of mill and elevator explosions, and then for the prevention of cotton-gin explosions and fires. We reduced that \$60,000, leaving an appropriation of \$75,000. Now, I would like to ask the acting chairman of the committee [Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi], in charge of the bill, where that would be taken off, namely, whether it was for the prevention of mill and elevator explosions, or for what part?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It was agreed in the committee that we would leave the three executive officers that would have the execution of this law to apportion, under the direction of the Secretary, the amount that was reduced by the committee from the total amount, so that the total amount would be reduced proportionately from the several amounts proposed to be used in these bureaus of the Government.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand that the Department of Agriculture is traveling around the country to prevent explosions?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Do they prevent these explosions before they occur or during the conflagration, or what is it they are doing to prevent explosions?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I will explain that.

Mr. WALSH. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, this provision is an appropriation of \$40,100 for traveling expenses. It also makes provision for 42 extra men. The first is for the prevention of thrasher explosions, and provides for 23 men. I suppose it would take 23,000 men to investigate the thrashers that are traveling around the country. The only thing that they can do to prevent these explosions is to see that the machines are well oiled and that there is no smoking around while the thrashing is going on.

The second item I know something about, which is the prevention of mill and elevator explosions. I have a mill and an elevator and know something about the work and conditions under which they are operated. I am also a director in a large insurance company which places millions of dollars of insurance on flour mills, and it has men to go around and investigate and report to the company. If a mill owner does not keep his mill clean his insurance is revoked. This item is for the purpose of

enabling them to go around and tell the different mill and elevator owners the necessity for cleaning up their establishments. And I would suggest to the department they ought to have another bureau, and that is one to investigate the mill owner or his business or his books or his last statement, as those are among the causes of a great many explosions, especially when the business is not a paying proposition.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not a fact that the insurance companies, for their own protection and the protection of the mill owners, make these various investigations themselves, and the cost of it is included in the cost to the owners indirectly, and for which they pay?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I believe that this item would be absolutely useless.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, these insurance men are experts, but the department aids are scientists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say but very little in reference to this. This is an item which is earnestly urged by the Department of Agriculture. It was strongly presented to the committee by the chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, Dr. Alsberg, who is one of the most scientific men in the department, and a man possessing as much information as any gentleman now in the employment of the Agricultural Department. In addition to that, I talked with the Secretary himself in reference to this item and asked him his views in regard to it. He stated to me in so many words that he considered it exceedingly important, and that he wanted this appropriation made. The committee saw proper to reduce the amount from the amount estimated. That reduction is made in the total of the bill. This appropriation as presented here is for the work proposed to be done, but, of course, it will be curtailed to the extent of the amount of reduction of the amount of money provided for.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. WELLING. Can the gentleman state, in a word, why he objects to the different items being itemized here?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Because when you put in provisions and itemize the bill throughout, and specify the amount that may be expended for different purposes, then you tie down the department absolutely to the specific amount for the specific purpose which might be mentioned in the bill. The general provisions of the bill place the discretion in the Secretary of Agriculture to use this money for these purposes in a general way to secure best results. The work to be undertaken is stated in the estimates. It is proposed by the department to use the money for these purposes so far as known now, but if something should arise suddenly, as things are arising under conditions as now existing in this country, then we want him to have the discretion to allot such money as might be necessary to take care of the situation. And this is the form of the bill that is desired by the Agricultural Department, and it is approved by the Secretary himself as the best way in which to make the appropriations to accomplish the results desired.

Mr. WELLING. I notice that there is here an appropriation, according to the gentleman's amendment, for sugar-beet nematode work, \$10,000. Have we any assurance, without that amendment going in, that any of this money will be expended in eradicating nematode in sugar beets?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It certainly will be expended in that way, probably that amount, possibly more than that, if the emergency should arise. Suppose it should be demonstrated by absolute observation that the disease was greater and covered a larger territory than at present supposed; if the appropriation is made in the lump sum, as it is made here, the Secretary could go beyond the \$10,000. And that is the very reason why it is in the bill as it is.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman said this item was specifically asked for by the Secretary. Does the gentleman mean that the Secretary asked for it in a lump sum before the committee?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The Secretary himself was not before the committee.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I mean that the department asked for it specifically?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I stated that I had a personal conversation with the Secretary himself and talked over the whole bill with him from one end of it to the other, and we considered in that connection in our conversation this specific

item; I asked him as to the necessity of this particular item, and whether or not it could be reduced.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the amendment offered shows that the addition was wrong in this case. Does the gentleman advocate that?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. If the addition is shown to be wrong, we will correct it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman announce that he believes in the policy of lump-sum appropriations for the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Not in a general way, not all the time, because we appropriate in the annual appropriation bill in detail and segregate the items. But this is an emergency appropriation, which is intended to take care of conditions as they may arise and as they come up suddenly and unexpectedly. For the general work of the Department of Agriculture we make all of the appropriations in detail and segregate them and report the several items in the bill.

You can do that with reference to the activities of the department itself, because the officials of the department, from the Secretary down to the various chiefs of bureaus and divisions, know what the actual necessities of the department will be in order to carry on the normal work of the department. But no man can read the future, and therefore it is impossible for anybody to tell what will arise suddenly calling for immediate and prompt action. Therefore these appropriations in this emergency bill were made in that way a year ago, and that plan has been followed in this bill at this time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then the gentleman does not believe in that as a regular policy?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I do not believe in it as a regular policy. Regular and normal appropriations should be itemized. In emergency appropriations, in times like these, discretion should be given.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then why does the gentleman oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Because of the reason I have just expressed to the gentleman from Ohio. It is because of the difference in the purposes of the bill. In the annual bill we know what the normal activities are, but nobody can tell what the necessities might be and what might arise to be taken care of under this bill, hence the necessity for discretion to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have a little more time. I move to strike out the last word myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised to hear my friend defend this policy of lump-sum appropriations, particularly in view of the fact that I have listened for so many years to his eloquent argument in favor of the appropriation for that beautiful river, the Tombigbee.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am in favor of the largest lump-sum appropriation which the Government will give for that purpose and which the gentleman from Ohio will lend me his transcendent ability to obtain. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. As a war measure?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have always supported consistently the gentleman's appropriations intended specifically for the use of the Tombigbee River; but I would not support, and I do not think the gentleman would ask me to support, a lump-sum appropriation to be expended by the Secretary of War, who, perchance, in his wisdom might see fit not to give any portion of that appropriation to the gentleman's river. Therefore I am surprised, as I say, to hear the gentleman advocate what I regard as practically an indefensible matter, namely, the making of appropriations in lump sums for the Government service. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am always for the Tombigbee, and I do not want my good friend to ever give me out on that great enterprise. I invite his help and assistance, and together we will yet improve that great river and preserve the commerce of the Nation. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the pro forma amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON], because it is in line with the insistent demand of this House in the matter of the preparation of appropriation bills, that they should be itemized. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], inadvertently of course, has not stated the real situation. Appropriation bills are usually, if

not always, properly itemized, as demanded by the House and as is eminently proper.

This is not an emergency appropriation; these appropriations are not intended to be placed at the disposal of the Secretary of Agriculture to do just as he may please with them. These are appropriations urged during this year of war for particular work, and the committee took action on each particular item, and designated definitely how much money should be used for each particular line of work in which the Department of Agriculture should engage.

Every regular appropriation bill passed by the Congress for the Department of Agriculture contains a provision to the effect that during the year for which the appropriation is provided the Secretary of Agriculture may divert 10 per cent of the money appropriated for one purpose and use it for another purpose different from that for which it was specifically appropriated. That is necessary in order that he may meet an emergency respecting any line of work in which the department is engaged. That matter was brought up in the Committee on Agriculture when this bill was under consideration. It was suggested that the usual 10 per cent provision be inserted in this bill to give the Secretary of Agriculture the opportunity of diminishing or increasing the amount intended to be used for one purpose and applying the difference to other purposes, and the committee refused to insert that provision in this bill, insisting that the particular amounts it fixed are all that should be allowed for particular lines of work.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If the records of the committee show the full action of the committee, they will show exactly what I have stated.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Was there any proposition to include in this bill any provision for the shifting of funds to the extent of 10 or 20 per cent in this bill?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. There was; 10 per cent was suggested.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I do not remember it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It was suggested before the committee, and it met with no approval from any member of the committee. It was insisted, and the committee decided, that the Department of Agriculture should be held to the use of the specific amount set opposite each proposition.

Now, the gentleman says he wishes to give large authority to the Secretary of Agriculture. I have attended all, or nearly all, of the meetings of the committee. I am familiar with the discussions had on these particular matters. I know of the increases that were made, because some items were increased, and I know of the reductions that were made, and I know why they were made. The reductions were not as large as some of us demanded, but we could not have our way. We asked that some of these items be eliminated altogether.

Now, when this bill is brought in carrying lump sums, we find two millions, and so recommended, for one item, and \$800,000 for another, and we know, of course, that a lot of these separate items have been put together to make the total amounts. I have diligently gone through the estimates and through all the memoranda available that were made or used at the time the committee was considering this bill in an effort to find the separate amounts which put together would make these aggregate sums, and I have been unable to find the amounts or to make the proper calculation of the sums that would foot up the gross amounts carried in these lump-sum items; and I insist, Mr. Chairman, that neither the Secretary of Agriculture nor anybody else can take this law after it has been passed in this form and determine how much money is available for use under any one of the particular items contained in the estimates that we considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That was urged before the House yesterday when the other amendment, similar to this, was offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], in charge of this bill, insisted that the Secretary of Agriculture should have large discretion, should be permitted to spend money without any restriction whatever, admitting what I said, that

it would be necessary for the Secretary to go to the office of the Committee on Agriculture and look over the minutes of its meetings and see what amounts had been fixed for each particular line of work. If that is not a ridiculous proposition I never heard one. I never knew of a law being passed along such lines. Suppose the Secretary should not do it; and, of course, he would not do it.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. The statement made by the gentleman is certainly a very important one. As I understand him, he says that in the estimates made by representatives of the department of separate items that constitute the gross amounts that are appropriated for he has failed in any instance to find that they aggregate as much as the amounts contained in this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have been unable to pick out the different items and put them together and add them together and make the aggregate as carried in these lump-sum appropriations; no one can do it without referring to the minutes of the Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman from New Jersey, like myself, has made inquiry and investigation, and he says there is a discrepancy in this very item, and he is unable to account for it.

Mr. TOWNER. Then it is utterly impossible for the House to understand whether or not the amounts asked for in this bill are really recommended by the representatives of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is entirely true, and further along the line I have spoken of, about the difficulty confronting the Secretary of Agriculture, he will be unable to determine how much the committee has recommended or how much Congress has appropriated for any particular line of work. It will be impossible for him to determine.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Would it be impossible to tell what salaries the men who are to be employed, the experts, shall receive under this lump-sum appropriation? Will not they be able very readily to determine the salaries that the men will get?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is a very pertinent question. In these different lines of work many men are to be employed. In some lines the salaries are high and in some they are comparatively low. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] says, they run from \$100 a month to \$300 a month. We did make large reductions in some of the amounts which would provide for large salaries, and in some cases we lifted the recommendation for the cheaper work, as we may call it, the department wished to do. In some cases we increased the appropriation which would provide for paying the smaller salaries.

How in the world can the Secretary of Agriculture know whether he is enabled under the appropriation to employ men at high salaries or at low salaries? How can he tell anything about it? And if he should be given the unlimited authority or discretion which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] suggests he should have, and as he will have if the bill in its present form shall become a law, what is to prevent him from using the entire amount in hiring and paying men at the higher salaries? There is no limit upon his authority. Congress has determined, and the Appropriations Committee of this House have almost invariably brought in bills in accordance with that determination, that these matters should be itemized as far as possible. We are departing radically from that rule without any possible excuse for it.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman in reference to a statement made yesterday. I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to say that there were covered in this bill 11,000 employees.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Later on the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] stated that this was identical with the bill as passed last year. There seems to be a great conflict of opinion as to that—whether there are to be 11,000 new employees.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Pardon me, but the gentleman from Missouri can get his own time.

Mr. RUBEY. But the gentleman from Massachusetts has made a misstatement concerning me, and I want to correct it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman from Missouri can get time to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has the floor, and he yields to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. A similar bill passed a year ago, was in operation for only a few months, and about 5,400

were employed. Under this bill some 11,000 employees will be provided for, a part of them engaged a year ago and the rest will be employed now, and all will be paid out of money we are now appropriating; that is, this bill will provide for about 6,000 men in addition to the 5,400 employed under the bill of last year, or more than 11,000 altogether. Or, to state it in another way, 5,400 employed last year will be continued in their jobs and 6,000 will be added this year, making more than 11,000 altogether, and they will all be paid out of money provided by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to correct a statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], I know unintentionally. I did not say that the bill was identical in the number of employees. I said it was identical in language and identical in purpose; that the appropriations, however, were different, and that it was not identical in the number of men employed. This bill will carry additional men.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman say how many he considers it will carry?

Mr. RUBEY. It will not carry 11,000 additional men.

Mr. TREADWAY. How many?

Mr. RUBEY. Probably two or three thousand. There are now included in the Department of Agriculture about 16,000 or 17,000, as I stated yesterday. This bill we are now considering provided for 7,000 men, making a total of about 22,000 men. There will be some additions, because, as I said yesterday, it is proposed to put a farm demonstrator, if possible, in every county in the United States, and every time we get a good man and put him into a county as a farm demonstrator that will add one man to the pay roll. There is no question about that. There will be others added to the pay roll.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. RUBEY. I do not know whether I ought to yield or not, because the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] refused to yield to me, his colleague on the committee, and said that I could get time in my own right.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I would have yielded for a question, but not for a long statement.

Mr. RUBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAUGEN. I take it the gentleman will accept the figures submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture and put in the estimates. If he will accept these figures he will find the figures are exactly 11,907. The gentleman knows the committee reduced the appropriation to some extent and estimated about 11,000. That is not increasing it over the number employed last year. I gave the exact figures yesterday. The total number estimated in the Book of Estimates, 11,907. Now, the total number employed last year under the food-survey bill was 6,280; total increase, 5,627.

Mr. RUBEY. Now, the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture and the secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture is that the number of men used under this bill is about 7,000, and there will be two or three thousand added to that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Six thousand two hundred and eighty.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUBEY. Go ahead.

Mr. SWITZER. Speaking about the farm demonstrators, and so forth, do they have to devote all their time to this work?

Mr. RUBEY. They do.

Mr. SWITZER. Then, they are prohibited from farming and the actual production of food—

Mr. RUBEY. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SWITZER. I want to know—

Mr. RUBEY. I am asking the gentleman a question. Will he answer it?

Mr. SWITZER. If I can.

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman has in his State a number of superintendents of schools in every county, has he not? Does that superintendent of schools in each county teach school or act as supervisor of schools?

Mr. SWITZER. The farmers are rising up in my State against the proposition—

Mr. RUBEY. I am sorry for them.

Mr. SWITZER. Some farmers are going to beat a man in the primaries right in my own county, so they say, because he is a school-teacher. We have got now a farm demonstrator, or some sort of farm supervisor, in my county. How many have we got to support who will not be producing anything?

Mr. RUBEY. You have one good supervisor in your county, and you ought to have him, and you ought to have one good woman to help the women in that county. Thus, you have two, or you ought to have them. I do not know whether—

Mr. SWITZER. We are not asking for any more.

Mr. RUBEN. Now, I shall decline to yield. I want to say just one word. A great deal has been said about lump-sum appropriations and about the appropriations provided in this bill. In our regular agricultural appropriations we have always endeavored in every possible way to give the House the information necessary and to subdivide this work and report the appropriations together in an itemized statement, so we know just what we are doing in this and in that particular line. Now, then, as has been said by the gentleman from Mississippi, this is emergency work and comes up here during war times. We do not know to-morrow what may be needed over in the State of Kansas to take care of pests in connection with wheat. We do not know what may happen next week or month in connection with hog cholera. It may be necessary for the Department of Agriculture to take a great deal more money that would be used in a certain item here to take care of some particular emergency. Now, I want to say another thing. I was called to order yesterday for talking about things that occurred in the committee. I am going to talk about something that did not occur in committee. If there was in the committee a word said about reporting this bill in an itemized form I never heard it, and I was right there when the bill was reported. No member of the committee said anything about it, and yet to-day they come here and ask for an itemized bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Let me see if I can arrive at how much time will be needed.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the committee, and I want to be heard in reply to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has not been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to this paragraph close at the end of 10 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. And I to have five minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. How much does the gentleman want?

Mr. ANDERSON. I want five minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent that all debate close on this amendment and all amendments to the section at the end of 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph, the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto shall terminate at the expiration of 30 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Will the gentleman give the names of the gentlemen who are to speak?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], five minutes; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENBERG], five minutes; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], a member of the committee, five minutes; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], five minutes; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], five minutes; and I reserve five minutes for myself.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] had the floor a few moments ago I asked him whether he agreed with the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] yesterday in regard to the increase of number of employees, and I referred to the speech made yesterday by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEN]. He at once said that I had misquoted him, saying we passed this bill a year ago. Now, my impression from what had been said came from listening to the gentleman from Missouri at that time, and in order to verify my impression I want to quote the very language as it appears in the Record this morning of what the gentleman from Missouri did say:

This identical bill was passed by this Congress a year ago. We provided for these appropriations for the purpose of stimulating agriculture from one end of this country to the other. That work is being done now. The men have been employed, and they are now in the field.

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, I was justified in my inference that he gave the House to understand that this bill was identical with the bill which we previously passed.

Mr. RUBEN. It is identical.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is all I said, but the gentleman said I did not make a correct statement at the time.

Mr. RUBEN. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, and so do I.

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. RUBEN. I supposed the gentleman referred to the number of men employed in the department, but I did not state that the number that will be employed in the department under the provisions of this act are the same.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have not had access to the record of the committee, of course.

Mr. RUBEN. I would not have made that statement.

Mr. TREADWAY. But there is a very great difference between the members of the committee as to the number of additional employees that are to be added. The gentleman from Missouri said that there was to be something like 2,000, because the work has been so successful by those already employed. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HATGEN], who has the records before him, says there are to be nearly 6,000 additional employees.

There must be something wrong here somewhere when there is a difference of at least 4,000 among the members of the committee as to the probable employees under this act. It seems to me that we ought to have more definite information. Now, for instance, take that one item of the prevention of explosions. I understand there are at present employed by that department 17 men. There are to be 42 men added in that department, according to the estimates as submitted to the committee. Now, if there is useless duplication of employment it is by men who are going around snooping into the mills and factories, officially representing the Government, in order to do something that experts are employed to do by the insurance people and paid for by the mill owners themselves. They must have that class of people for their own self-protection, and why, in the name of all that is good, must we duplicate that work, unless it is as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] yesterday, in order to make positions for deserving men along toward election time?

I find that under this one amendment here there are provided at least 140 additional men, according to a hasty compilation by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON]. What are these people going to do that is beneficial to the farming interests of the country?

I represent such a community. I am always interested in the welfare of agricultural sections. I do not want to vote against this bill with a view of doing any injury to the farming interests, but I shall vote against the bill if it means that a political subterfuge and camouflage is being played here for the benefit of any aspiring political people looking for good positions for some of their subservient politicians.

That looks to me to be the real merit and crux of this bill. I think those of the committee who are taking an attitude in opposition to it are upon sound ground.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman does not really believe the Agricultural Department is asking these appropriations from Congress to be used for political purposes, does he?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not wish to pass judgment on the merits of the various people in the executive departments at the present time. I should rather leave it to the judgment of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I doubt if the gentleman really believes that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think we have gotten rather far away from the merits of the amendment now pending. There is a great deal of the work under the general item which we are discussing which is valuable. It seeks to provide a fund for the elimination, eradication, and control of the diseases of plants, and thereby to conserve the food supply of the country. There are many of us who are in sympathy with much, if not all, of the work which will be done under this general item.

But the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] does not in any way affect the work which will be done under this item. It is amendment of form entirely rather than an amendment of substance, although it is an extremely important amendment from the standpoint of making this legislation what it ought to be. In order to understand just what this amendment does it is necessary to keep in mind just how this bill was made up.

The Secretary of Agriculture in making his estimates for this bill followed, in a general way, the same form of language that was in the bill we passed last year. But under each one of these general items he segregated each particular item of work. In other words, he made a statement of each project which was to be conducted under the general language, and accompanied each item with a statement of the character of the work which was to be done under it. The committee considered each and every item, disallowed some of them in toto, I think, reduced some of the others, and increased a number of them.

Now, then, if the Secretary is to have any information at all as to what the committee allowed and as to what the House allowed, if the Secretary is to have any information as to what the Congress desires to have done under this bill, then the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey ought to pass, because he can get his information only from the terms of the bill itself. If he does not get it from the terms of the bill, and he can not get it and ought not to get it from the minutes of the committee, he would then, under the terms of the law itself, be entitled to use this money for any of the general purposes mentioned in the general language. He would not be confined to the use of the money for the specific purposes for which the Committee on Agriculture allowed it, nor would he be confined in its expenditure to that which the House understands the money is appropriated for.

Now, one of the items which has been discussed, and which is covered by this language, is the item for the control of dust explosions, which has been referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Now, what we intend in that case is this: It is not an experimental item, not a research item, but it is a propaganda item pure and simple. The Bureau of Chemistry has made some experiments touching the causes of explosions in thrashing machines. They observed that most of these explosions were caused by the creation of static electricity in the pulleys and belts of the machines, and that by a suitable system of commutators and electric wiring that static electricity could be gathered and grounded, so that it would not cause a spark and thus set fire to the dust in the machine. Now, this item is intended for work among the people who run these thrashing machines, to induce them to adopt the methods worked out by the Bureau of Chemistry for the purpose of preventing explosions in such machine.

Practically the same kind of work will be done under the item for the prevention of explosions in flour mills. Any man who wants to put on any one of these preventive instruments can do it. He can get them on the market. There is nothing secret about it. It is simply a question of whether he wants to do the thing which the Bureau of Chemistry says can be effectively done in order to prevent explosion.

It seems to me that the Secretary of Agriculture ought not to be in the business of soliciting for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I was considerably surprised yesterday when the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] was voted down, and I was more surprised at the arguments used against it. For instance, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], said, in defense of this lump-sum appropriation, that he had seen on this floor pension bills carrying hundreds of millions passed in a few hours; that he had seen the post office bill passed in a few hours, and inasmuch as those committees had done wrong he thought this committee ought to be entitled to do wrong also.

Now, the trouble with the illustration was that it did not fit. There is no lump-sum appropriation in the pension bill. Everybody ought to know that, especially the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. Is there any authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior to distribute pensions around among his favorites, as it could be done under this lump-sum appropriation? Not at all.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The pension appropriation bill, which passed the other day, carried in a lump sum \$185,000,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. There is no authority there to distribute it to Tom, Dick, and Harry, as there is under this bill to distribute the salaries to whom they please.

But however that may be, it is no defense of a wrong bill to say that some other bill is worse than this. That is no defense at all. It has been the uniform practice and it is recognized to be good legislation to have segregated items everywhere, and in this bill especially there is more necessity for it than ever. What is there in this war argument that it is a great necessity, and therefore we should not segregate these items and thereby limit the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to distribute this money as he might see wise? War? Yes; we are at war. God knows we are at war. We have to raise large sums of money. Is that an admonition that we should use that money economically and wisely or not? Is it not an admonition for economy when we see the solicitation of the children's pennies for war stamps, when we see the solicitation

for larger sums for liberty bonds, when we see everybody straining every effort to contribute to the war, when this magnificent effort is made on the part of the women and children of the United States to raise funds for the war? Is not that an admonition to us when we are considering an appropriation bill that we should prevent waste in the expenditure?

One of the objects of the bill is said to be preventing waste. My God! Can you ever find a more wastefully framed bill on the statute books than the one that is brought in here? [Applause.] Never. It literally encourages wasteful expenditures. I am surprised that anybody on that side of the House, after his attention has been called to it, will vote against a proposition to segregate these items, as desired by the gentleman from New Jersey. [Applause.] It seems to me to be unthinkable in these times, when we are raising money in the way we are, that we should outdo all the wasteful Congresses of the past in order to bring in here a bill that is an example of wastefulness in itself. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I know it is unpleasant for that side of the House to hear these statements, but I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). The committee will be in order. The gentleman from Minnesota will proceed.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am very glad to see that the Members on that side of the House over there are listening and paying attention to every word. I hope what I say will fall upon willing ears. I say it is a most important thing these days that we should scrutinize every appropriation bill which, unless modified as is proposed in this amendment, would give discretion to spend enormous amounts on new-fangled theories like the one described by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] about explosions. The committee has done faithful work here and has determined, according to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], the sums that ought to be and could be wisely spent on each of these subjects. Now you propose to give discretion to some bureaucrat to spend the money as he pleases.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] in charge of this bill says he is willing to trust the Secretary of Agriculture. Well, what does the Secretary of Agriculture know about the administration of these affairs? The office of Secretary of Agriculture is getting so big now that he can not possibly devote his personal attention to these things. He has got to leave it to some bureaucrat, some head of a bureau that thinks he owns the world, and most of them do. We have experience of that. No; let Congress make the limitation and not leave it to them to spend as they please. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to understand why some of the gentlemen here are causing so much delay in the passage of this very important measure. This is a short bill, only five pages long. The House commenced to consider it on Friday. This is Tuesday. This is an emergency measure, made necessary by the war, and yet gentlemen are holding up the House in its passage of this measure because it confers discretionary powers on the Secretary of Agriculture about matters of small magnitude compared with some of the colossal powers that they have put in the hands of other departments.

But this measure, pertaining to the business of the farmers of the country, is held up by gentlemen who undertake to hamstring it, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] suggests that it is an effort to play politics. I submit to this House and to the people who will read this record in the fall time that the effort to play politics comes from another quarter in this House. There is no politics being played by the administration in its conduct of the war. The President, at the outset, when a man was needed to lead Russia to the light, appointed the great lawyer, Mr. Root, a Republican. Not long ago he appointed ex-President Taft to an important position in this city. Recently he appointed the great lawyer Hughes, a Republican, to make an important investigation. The cry of politics falls flat, and ill does it become gentlemen who are going to have to face their record this fall to talk about politics in connection with a measure like this and then vote for the measure.

Gentlemen, it will be said to some on both sides this fall, "I know you voted for the bill; but you did all you could to delay it, and you did all you could to defeat it until the record vote came, and then you swallowed it, after doing all you could to make it obnoxious and loathsome."

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that we may be able to come together here and pull together in the passage of this bill. It is an important measure. Why, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] voted for the food-control bill, that outlined

this very work. This is a supplementary measure, necessary to carry out the purposes of the original bill. Why gentlemen will take up time now and delay the passage of this measure, which the Secretary of Agriculture is hoping will pass speedily, I can not understand.

Gentlemen, let us quit it. Let us get together. If we have serious objections, let us present them and get through with them and pass the bill. We are not conferring extraordinary powers here; nothing at all compared with some of the powers that we have conferred without much debate in this House. I trust that gentlemen will support this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I trust when we read the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], just concluded, to-morrow morning we will notice at the close in brackets the word "applause," the echoes of which still reverberate. I do not believe that Members on that side of the House or Members on this side of the House are going to be frightened by this prattle about the emergency and about the delay in the passage of this measure. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, the millions are coming too easily from the pockets of the taxpayers. The heads of departments are not imbued with the spirit of economy. They come up and submit their estimates and then insist—as I understand they do insist, or, at least, express the strong desire, as in this instance—that we should pass bills in lump-sum appropriations. I wonder why the distinguished chairman in this instance, instead of putting this bill into six or seven paragraphs, did not put it all into three or four lines, lump it all into one appropriation of \$18,000,000, or whatever the total may be.

Now, I do not believe that the farmers of this country, or the laboring people of this country or any other class of our people, are dependent for signifying or demonstrating their patriotism upon appropriations made out of the Federal Treasury. I deny it as far as the farmers are concerned and as far as the laboring people are concerned. I do not believe we have got to stimulate the farmers' patriotism by appointing farm supervisors in every county of the Republic or by appointing demonstrators as to how to make cottage cheese in the various rural communities of this Nation.

Furthermore, I submit that we should follow the plan of this measure, as we have in other emergency measures and other annual appropriation bills, by itemizing the appropriations and say to the heads of departments, "You have available for this purpose a certain amount of money, and if it is not sufficient, under the general powers you possess, you can exceed that sum and trust to Congress to make it up in a deficiency appropriation."

The gentleman from Alabama, after an absence of several days from the House, displaying himself, I presume, in all his pristine splendor to some of the communities in his great Commonwealth, making appeals for patriotic purposes, which he can so well do, comes back all fussed up because this bill was taken up on Friday and we have not passed it before he returns. And, forsooth, he must get up and read a lecture because gentlemen rise on the floor and take part in legitimate discussion and legitimate amendments, and because of this he charges delay.

I suppose that he is one of the gentlemen who is anxious that we should adjourn by the 1st of July, so that he can go back to his constituency and perhaps persuade them and the people of his State that he ought to be elevated to some other body in response to a suggestion contained in a letter which he sent out under his own frank to the wondering public within the great State of Alabama. [Applause.] That great constituency that is sitting there in fear and trembling waiting upon the decision which he shall make of that momentous question—whether he should run for the Senate or return to the House. For this he would presumably hasten us up and hurry us along without debate or consideration or discussion of the appropriations of billions, which many of these bills carry.

The time will come, Mr. Chairman, when the people of this country will ask their chosen representatives, Why did we vote for these measures and why did we not ascertain the reasons for these lump-sum appropriations?

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the people of this Republic expect us to pass measures without due consideration and due deliberation. I think they expect us to remain here in the House and consider and discuss every proposition that is made to us, whether it takes a week or two weeks, or all summer, and to do it calmly, dispassionately, and patriotically; and if we do that there will be no furor at the homes or at the firesides of the people of this Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to the proposition pending before the House, and that is the question we have up for consideration. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, which is the pending

amendment before the House, proposes to segregate the various items and fix the specific sums which shall be appropriated for each activity. The provisions of the bill are in accordance with the bill passed a year ago, and the appropriations under the bill passed a year ago were exactly like the appropriations under this bill. There is no difference between them, except in amounts; there is no difference in language or difference in purpose. That bill received practically the unanimous vote of the House. There were only 5 votes, as I recollect, against it. Now, if it was good legislation then, why should you not continue the language of the bill; why should you change the plans that were then adopted and pursue a different plan when you are making appropriations for the work that was begun under the plan inaugurated a year ago and has proven successful?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I can not yield, I have only a short time. It was stated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENSON] a moment ago that there was never a more wasteful proposition proposed on the floor of the House than in this bill. It is wasteful, wonderfully wasteful, is it not, to appropriate \$11,000,000 to stimulate and encourage the agricultural interests of the whole United States of America! Is it not awful and horrible to think about, to expend \$11,000,000 to help the agricultural interests and assist the farmers when they are standing under the burden placed upon them as well as other people in the appropriations of billions of dollars.

Let us look at the result. The great stimulation of agriculture in farm products during the year 1917 was brought about to some extent, and I believe to a considerable extent, by the appropriations of the last annual Agricultural bill and the emergency bill.

The total amount of production last year of farm products was \$19,413,849,381, while the total amount of the products during the year 1916 was \$13,406,364,011, making an increase in 1917 of \$6,037,485,370 over 1916.

The total amount of products in 1917 exceeded the average for five years previous by \$10,055,083,502.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I have not the time to yield. When the farmers of this country are producing this enormous quantity and value of agricultural products and are patriotically responding to every request made of them, when they have produced this more than nineteen billions of dollars in a single year, some people see fit to get up on the floor of the House and talk about wastefulness and extravagance in an appropriation of the sum of \$11,000,000 to help them in their work and to stimulate and encourage the agriculture of the country. The man who does it is no friend of the farmer and not in sympathy with him. I think you had better talk about wastefulness somewhere else. I do not like to hear people talking about economy when it comes to the great tillers of the soil—the people who in the sweat of their faces produce the wealth of this country and support its institutions and patriotically respond to its requests. [Applause.] Let economy be practiced on somebody else. [Applause.] I would much rather hear them talk about wastefulness and the practice of economy in some other directions in this country where it could be practiced, and where in all probability it should be. Reduce some of the billions that are being appropriated and quit talking about the insignificant sum of \$11,000,000 appropriated in this bill for the benefit of the whole agricultural interests of the United States of America when the production of agriculture added over \$19,000,000,000 to the wealth of this country last year. [Applause.] I appeal to the Membership of the House to defeat this amendment, and to let the discretion remain in the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on this work as it was begun, and which he has so successfully done up to the present time, as shown by the results. If the work already begun has brought about these results, why change the plans and risk the possibility of injuring the service already begun. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi to act as tellers.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 46, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fourth. For increasing food production and eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food by educational and demonstrational methods, through county, district, and urban agents and others, \$6,100,000.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A moment ago when I was pleading for speedy action

upon the passage of this bill the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] took occasion to refer to the fact that I had been absent for a few days. I had been absent making patriotic speeches down in my State. I wired to the gentleman from Mississippi, who is one of the best friends the farmer ever had in Congress, to know if it was necessary for me to immediately return. I should have been here on Friday, but believing as he did that nobody would seriously oppose a measure looking out for the development of the agricultural interests and the carrying on of this great work during the war, he said that he did not think there would be any opposition to the bill, and that there was no necessity for me to return. But I am here now. The gentleman from Massachusetts suggests that I am one of those who wish Congress to adjourn early in order that I may go down into Alabama and see if I can induce the people of the State of Alabama to send me to the Senate. This is the second time that Republicans here have injected themselves into this senatorial situation in my State. You can not fool me, gentlemen. I know the earmarks and just what is back of such performances. There are Democrats in public life who get Republicans to play their tricks for them; but it will not work with me, nor will it work with the people of my State. If I desire to submit my candidacy to the people of my State, I shall do so in obedience to the call of the people of the State and in response to my duty as I see it. I paid for the postage on the letters that the gentleman says I franked in connection with the office of Senator in Alabama. While I am still of the opinion that it was frankable because of its reference to public questions, the Post Office Department thought that it contained a line or two which took it out of the class of frankable matter; but that should not worry the gentleman from Massachusetts. I suppose that the gentleman is one of those who favor selling to the United States Government the pneumatic-tube service, the greatest piece of graft ever foisted upon a free people. I trust that we may adjourn before that can be unloaded upon the American people for \$4,400,000. It is repudiated by every postal expert in the Government, denounced by every postmaster where it has been operated, opposed by the chairman of the Post Office Committee of this House and by the Postmaster General of the United States. I shall be here to fight that when the gentleman advocates it upon the floor of this House. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUTCHINSON: Page 3, line 2, after the word "others," insert "for the following stated purposes and in amounts as follows: Fruit and vegetable utilization, \$35,000; general administration of extension work, \$35,000; home-economics work, \$25,000; extension work in Northern and Western States, \$134,200; county-agent work, \$1,893,000; boys' and girls' club work, \$382,000; home-demonstration work, \$1,327,400; extension work in Southern States, \$90,000; county-agent work, \$1,333,815; boys' club work, \$75,300; home-demonstration work, \$803,385; total, \$6,135,000"; and strike out the figures "\$6,100,000."

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have discussed this amendment, I wonder if we can not agree on a time for debate. I ask unanimous consent that all debate close upon this amendment and all amendments thereto in 30 minutes, 5 minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], and 5 by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON], the remaining 5 minutes to be occupied by me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the time to be occupied as indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is for the purpose of itemizing the entire paragraph. When these 11 items were before the committee there were no reductions in any one of the 11. The total amount of the estimates submitted by the bureau was \$6,135,000. The bill before the House carries in this section \$6,100,000, showing a reduction in the estimates of \$35,000, when there were no reductions in any of the 11 items. This work is practically for extension work, for county-agent work, in Northern, Western, and Southern States. You notice in the itemized amendment boys' club work and home demonstration work, but practically all of it is for salaries and expenses of demonstrators. There has been no change in the different items. As I said, my only object in offering the amendment is to set the Department of Agriculture right, but there is an error of \$35,000 in the total amount of this section. This amendment of mine gives \$35,000 more than is asked for in this section of the original bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I do not see the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] in the House at the present time. It has been reserved for him to give a new reason why we should vote for this bill. The gentleman intimates, if he does not expressly so state, that in case anyone upon this side, or the other side for that matter, has the temerity to vote against this bill some one will be sent out into his district this fall and his constituents will be told that he voted against a war emergency measure. Now, who that will be who will go out I do not know. I have too much respect for all the gentlemen on the other side with whom I have any personal acquaintance to anticipate that any of them would go out into my district and do so. If they want to, however, they may have the opportunity, because I am going to vote against this bill unless it is amended so as to make it more acceptable. I might say also that I understood that the gentleman from Alabama intimated that nobody dared to vote against this bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman from Alabama did not intimate anything of the sort, but whoever does do it must take his stand in the record.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen must not interrupt without the consent of the gentleman having the floor.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think everyone in the House heard what the gentleman from Alabama said and knew what he meant. His meaning was plain enough, and I want to know if it has reached that state of affairs here that a Member can not endeavor to reduce the amount carried by any of these bills; that he can not say, "I will not vote for a bill because it contains unnecessary extravagances and waste," without being threatened that somebody will go out into his district and say he refused to vote for an emergency war measure? If we have reached that stage in our deliberations, let me say we are proceeding so that this Nation will come to bankruptcy before we finish this war. It is not the way to win the war; it is the way to lose the war. Shall we pay no attention to matters of economy, pay no attention to waste, pay no attention to incompetence? If so, we might as well not consider the bills at all. Why is this bill brought in making appropriations in these lump sums? The only explanation that can possibly be given is that if the items were given a large number of them would be stricken out or reduced. This bill might just as well be cut down one-half and answer all purposes. But we have got it here in such a form that we can not reduce it; we can not cut it down. We might itemize it, and to that extent the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey is an excellent one, because it would leave the bill in better shape than it is now, but this is not what we need. We need another bill, so itemized that we can reach these items, and refuse to vote for those we did not approve and thought were unnecessary, and cut down those altogether too large. That is the form in which this bill ought to have been presented.

Now, the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, for whom I have the highest respect and esteem, stated here yesterday that we had voted for much larger bills here in connection with the Army and Navy and put them through in quicker time than we have this. Very true. They were emergency measures, and yet I thought at the time, and I still think, that we did not take as much time for their discussion as we ought, and it was not necessary that we should rush them through in that manner. I may have been wrong about that, but this bill is not an emergency measure. This appropriation will not go into effect until the 1st of July, and if this bill is not passed and signed by the President until July 1 it will not make one bit of difference with the work of the department—

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Every employee employed under the emergency food bill, passed on the 10th of August, 1917, will go out on the 30th day of June unless this bill passes and is signed by the President and becomes a law before that time, and it will disorganize the whole work. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is one day's difference from what I said, and June 30 is more than a month distant. This is not an emergency measure, and any person who may go out over the country stating it is an emergency war measure will state something that is not the fact. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable controversy about the number of employees to be increased. If the gentleman from Missouri is present, I would like to call his attention to page 35, where he will find the items for the extension work, Northern and Western States. The estimated expenditure for 1918 is 1,524 employees; the number required

in 1919 is estimated at 3,707, an increase of 2,183. Turn to page 37 and he will find the item for the extension work in the Southern States. The required number for 1919 is 2,110; the estimated expenditure for 1918 is 1,147, an increase of 963.

If he will turn to page 57, he will find the item for special work in crop estimating. The number required in 1919 is reported as 2,938; the number estimated for 1918 is 68, an increase of 2,870.

He will find an increase in these items of more than 6,000 people, and yet we have been told repeatedly that there is practically no increase in the number of men to be employed by the department. As I have stated, and as I stated at the beginning, the estimate furnished by the department will require the employment of more than 11,907 people.

That is all I care to say.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does anybody on that side desire to be heard?

Mr. HAUGEN. The question for this House to determine is, Are we justified in appropriating this money in employing these 6,000 additional people. As I said the other day, I believe that 11,000 people could be employed to better advantage back of the plow rather than sending them over the country riding in Ford cars and automobiles. The question of food production is to be taken into consideration. If so, there is no question but that better results could be had. If we are to proceed in a business way, it is up to this committee and to Congress to report an itemized bill, so that all of these items could be segregated, so that everybody may know what the money is to be expended for; that the Secretary of Agriculture may have something for a guide as to how the money may be expended. If so, it is up to Congress to determine and to direct how it shall be appropriated.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment to itemize the appropriations so that Congress may know how much money is intended to be used and to put a limit on the amount that the Secretary could use in these particular lines of work.

I know of nothing that I can add to what I have said. This House knows I have always favored liberal appropriations for every legitimate purpose in connection with agriculture. I have always been in favor of this county-agent work, and nothing that I have said or may say should be taken in opposition to the principle on which it is founded. I introduced the first bill ever introduced in this House to provide for general employment of county agents throughout the country. A similar bill was later introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and became the law and is now the law. For that kind of work the regular appropriation bill carries something like a million and a quarter of money. This bill carries several hundred thousand dollars. It is impossible to find out the exact amount, because we do not know what items considered by our committee are included in this \$6,100,000. The Lever bill, the law to which I have referred, provides several million dollars now. It is a graduated affair, more available or to be appropriated one year than the year before, until it reaches a maximum of \$4,100,000, and that amount shall be annually appropriated thereafter. So you can see that there is a very large amount of money appropriated at different times and in different ways for this extension work and for county-agent work, as a part of it is called.

I favor the work. It is very important and necessary. Good results have followed it. I have objected, however, to the employment of so many men to take up different lines of this work, all of which are similar, work that could be done by one man. But there seems to be no disposition on the part of the House to make any restriction which will require the work to be done in the manner I have suggested.

Carried in this appropriation bill there are a lot of other things. We can not tell what they are, because the amounts were changed by the committee and a lot of amounts have been put together and made into this aggregate of \$6,100,000. No one can tell what they are; no one can tell without referring to the minutes of the Committee on Agriculture.

There are appropriations here of \$50,000 in relation to poultry. One gentleman, appearing before us, thought he had made a hit when he said that a large part of this money would be used to send men and women out into the country to induce the building of individual chicken houses and operate these houses during the war, when money is scarce, when it is necessary for us to enact unusual and burdensome tax laws.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And when the board of control, or whatever you call it, is putting an embargo on the movement of all kinds of building material.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. When we are spending tremendous sums of money, making appropriations almost without limit, and taxing the people to produce that money, we ought to go slow in the matter of these appropriations. It was said in the committee, and even urged before it, that these amounts are small—only a few thousand dollars—and comparison was drawn between them and the appropriation of millions, even billions, of dollars for other departments. We were asked why we would refuse an appropriation of a few thousand dollars for the Department of Agriculture; but these few thousands, added together, aggregate more than \$18,000,000, and some of them are, in my opinion, absolutely unnecessary. Our duty, as I see it, is to economize wherever we are able, cut down appropriations, and prevent extravagance and unnecessary use of money wherever we can. That is the duty of the Committee on Agriculture. We do not refuse or hesitate to make immediately available the large amounts, the billions of dollars, requested by the Committee on Military Affairs, for instance; but we have felt it our duty to restrict these amounts, demanded of our committee, even though they are small, wherever we could and to cut out unnecessary and wasteful items. We tried to do it. The committee in its bill has disregarded the action of the entire committee, the spirit of their action, as I understand it. The amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] will carry out that spirit as to itemizing the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this item provides for increasing the food production, eliminating waste, and promoting conservation of food by educational and demonstrational methods through county, district, and urban agents, and makes an appropriation of \$6,100,000. As I understand it, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] has offered an amendment providing that the object for which this money is to be appropriated shall be expressed in the appropriation.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] became quite eloquent a few minutes ago in trying to demonstrate the wonderful agricultural production that has come about through slight appropriations by Congress for agriculture. I think he stated that in 1916, in round numbers, the total amount of agricultural production, which includes live stock, was about \$13,000,000,000, and in 1917 it amounted to over \$19,000,000,000, an increase, if I understood him correctly, of \$6,031,000,000, and that this increase is accounted for by legislation such as this. But the gentleman failed to say that most of that increase came about by reason of the increased price at which the 1917 crop was valued over the value of 1916. If he would measure the production correctly, he would give the number of bushels of increase in each of the cereals and the number of cattle, hogs, and other live stock that had been produced in 1917 over the production in 1916.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. If I can have some more time.

The gentleman spoke also of the fact that we are only appropriating the small sum of \$17,000,000. He failed to call to the attention of the House that the agricultural appropriation bill carried over \$28,000,000.

The annual appropriations for permanent purposes carry over \$18,000,000, and the deficiency bill appropriated for seed and for forestry \$5,000,000 more, or a total, with this bill, of about \$60,000,000 for agricultural purposes this year.

Now, I do not complain of any wise appropriation for agricultural purposes, but a committee in the other room is to-day considering appropriations running into the billions of dollars, and the War Department is estimating down to the last dollar what it is going to cost to produce shot and shell to win this war. But this committee brings in a bill for \$18,000,000 without saying what the money is to be expended for, except that it is for "agricultural educational purposes." Why, I understand from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] that they propose to send men out to educate the farmers how to build individual chicken houses. [Laughter.] According to the hearings, they propose to spend \$80,000 to educate the housewives of America how to make cottage cheese. Why, I think if my friend from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] will go throughout the agricultural producing sections of the country, he will find that our farmers and our farmers' wives are pretty well educated with regard to some of these things, and some of them resent the fact that they will have men drawing high salaries paid from the proceeds of the sale of liberty bonds to carry on this war to teach the farmer how to build a chicken house, or to teach a familiar

household art to his patriotic wife, who knows more about making cottage cheese than any of the men you are going to employ and send throughout the country.

Oh, gentlemen, that is not the way to win this war; and before this war is over, it will not be so popular to come here and ask for lump-sum appropriations to do work of this kind, and it will not be very popular to vote for such appropriations. What are you going to do with it? That is not an unusual request. Under the law it was the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture on the 1st day of December to make an estimate, which would be open to Congress, showing just what he is going to need, and here six months have elapsed and we do not know what this \$18,000,000 is to be expended for. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised at the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], who has just taken his seat, when he complained of the appropriations we are making for agricultural purposes. Even if the appropriations made for the agricultural interests of the United States of America are in accordance with the figures which he furnishes—\$60,000,000—does the gentleman object to appropriating \$60,000,000 for the agricultural interests of the United States?

Mr. GOOD. No; if I know what it is being appropriated for.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi declines to yield.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman asked me a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman asked me a question, as I understood it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No; I was asking the House. I am always ready to yield, and I very rarely decline to yield; but I asked the gentleman from Iowa to yield to me, and he declined to do so.

Mr. GOOD. I thought the gentleman asked me a question. I beg the gentleman's pardon, if he did not ask me a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The Agricultural Department ask for these sums, and they are justified in doing so. I say that the appropriations made in the Agricultural bill and the emergency bill of last year and the emergency bill of this year have been fully justified by the results obtained.

The gentleman spoke about the increased price of agricultural products. I wondered then if he was objecting to that. I am willing for the farmers of the country to get the full price for their products, and I assume the gentleman himself is willing that they shall receive the full value.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman ask me a question now?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No.

Mr. GOOD. I voted against \$2.20 wheat. I do not believe that the agricultural interests are asking any great increase, or any increase at all in many of their products.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I do not yield.

Mr. GOOD. I thought the gentleman wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No; but I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. GOOD. I asked him if he did ask me a question, and he said he did not want me to answer it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No; I said I would yield in order that the gentleman might ask me a question, and I would try to answer it. I did not know whether I could answer it or not, but I was willing to try. I was not discussing wheat, and I was not discussing the gentleman's vote on wheat. I voted in that instance to sustain the President. I thought the gentleman voted the same way I did, because he spoke that way, and I presumed he had voted in accordance with the way he spoke. [Laughter.]

Now, then, coming back to the question at issue, this is an identical proposition with the one offered to the paragraph preceding, and to the paragraph preceding that, and the House has had two votes on these propositions, and it has voted them down, and I appeal to the House to vote this proposition down.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. [Mr. HUTCHINSON.]

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is asked for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 31, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDALL: Page 3, line 2, after the figures "\$6,100,000," insert:

"Provided, That in order to further eliminate waste and to promote conservation of food, it shall be unlawful during the existence of the war with Germany to use any food or food materials in the manufacture or preparation of alcoholic beverages."

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to have the gentleman state what his point of order is.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The point of order is that it is not germane to this bill and not germane to this paragraph. This paragraph is: "For increasing food production and eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food by educational and demonstrational methods, through county, district, and urban agents and others."

Mr. RANDALL. Is that the only reservation, that it is not germane to this paragraph?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It is not germane to the bill or to the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that it is not germane to the bill and that it is legislation.

Mr. RANDALL. Is that the extent of the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. During the discussion I may think of some other grounds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the point of order is that it is not germane to this paragraph.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Not germane to the bill, not germane to the purposes of the bill, and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RANDALL. That is a further ground—that it is legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first ground of the point of order—that is, that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph—let me read the paragraph:

For increasing food production and eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food by educational and demonstrational methods, through county, district, and urban agents and others.

Now, the amendment uses the identical language of the paragraph in the bill. My amendment reads:

In order to further eliminate waste and to promote conservation of food it shall be unlawful during the existence of the war with Germany to use any food or food materials in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages.

It seems to me that that answers the contention as to the amendment not being germane to the paragraph. The language is identical, the purpose is identical. Germane; of course!

As to the further point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, I call attention to the fact that the provisions of paragraph 4 as they appear in this bill are not permanent law in any act.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, legislation on this bill was made in order by the rule.

Mr. RANDALL. Then the amendment is in order. I did not know the provisions of the rule, but I call the attention of the Chairman to section 4 in this bill; the paragraph is not permanent law and only becomes law by being attached to this act. Therefore that paragraph is new legislation. Whether it is in order or out of order, this amendment is in order, for, as the gentleman from Massachusetts says, amendments have been made in order by the rule. Therefore the only question for the Chairman to decide is whether it is germane to the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the phraseology of this bill, from the paragraphs designated first to sixth, is in virtual identical language to section 8 of the food-survey and food-control law passed August 10, 1917. The first paragraph of the bill under consideration states that there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums for the purposes indicated.

There is nothing in this paragraph or in this bill which seeks to appropriate funds to regulate the use or conservation of food in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages. The present paragraph is limited to increased food production, eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food by educational and demonstrational methods through county, district, and urban agents.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. RANDALL. Would not the prevention of the use of a bushel of grain in the manufacture of alcohol be a conservation of food products by demonstrated methods?

Mr. STAFFORD. It would not in my opinion. Now, segregating the items which were included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey shows that this appropriation was to be used largely for salaries for educational and demonstrational methods. The gentleman seeks to incorporate a new legislative feature in the paragraph that is to restrict the use of food, to make it unlawful to utilize it. It has no direct relation; is not akin or related in any way to the authorization in the original bill or to that in the paragraph. If it is not related to those authorizations, I respectfully submit that it could not be considered as germane. It is new legislation entirely. When the gentleman, on a like occasion, sought on the Post Office appropriation bill—and I direct the Chairman's attention to the ruling of the Speaker on that question—to recommit the Post Office appropriation bill to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads with instructions to forbid the further carriage in the mail of any newspaper carrying advertising matter relating to liquors, the Speaker held that although there was under consideration in the Post Office appropriation bill an amendment to the Judicial Code that sought to restrain mailable matter so far as fraud was concerned, that that did not warrant a motion to recommit involving extraneous matter, although somewhat akin, that was carried in the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL].

The question was argued at great length by Members of the House—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], who upheld the position that it was germane, and the opposition by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], and by myself. The Speaker there held that it was not germane to the subject, although it was in a way distantly related to it because it related to restricting mail matter. The amendment reported by the committee sought to restrict mail matter so far as fraud was concerned and not advertising matter relating to liquor, and it was accordingly held not in order.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I only want a moment's time of the Chair; but, as I understand the amendment, it seems to me to be germane not only to the bill but to the paragraph to which it is offered. The rule of germaneness, subsection C says:

The general subject may be amended by a specific proposition of the same class.

Here is the general subject to increase food production, eliminate waste, and promote conservation of food. That is the general subject. Here is a specific subject, by withdrawing from brewers the use of food products for the manufacture of intoxicating liquors. If it is not germane to the provisions of this bill and to this particular section, I am frank to say that the question of germaneness is one that I can not distinguish, because it is a specific provision in a general proposition of food conservation and the prevention of waste.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, while I am personally in favor of the amendment on its merits, considering the parliamentary question that has been raised, it seems clear that the amendment proposed is not germane to the subject matter of the paragraph. In paragraph 4 it is proposed to make an appropriation for eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food "by educational and demonstrational methods." The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] proposes to eliminate waste and conserve food by making it unlawful to use certain foods. This is an entirely different proposition than is involved or than was contemplated by the language of the paragraph as it was reported to the House. The proposed amendment has nothing to do with educational or demonstrational methods of avoiding waste or in conserving foods and is clearly not germane to the thought or purpose of the legislation in the paragraph as it now stands. If one could offer an amendment like this and have it in order upon this paragraph, then almost any kind of legislation would be in order as an amendment to the paragraph. By an amendment, then, the use of any food product could be inhibited. Such a wide latitude for amendments would not, I believe, be contended for by the author of the amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. What does the gentleman say about the rule making the amendment in order?

Mr. NORTON. If this amendment were in order under the rule, it would have to be a germane amendment. An amendment in order on this paragraph, it seems to me, would be one that would propose some new or modified educational or demonstrational methods to conserve food or avoid waste, and not one along the line of enacting a prohibitory statute.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that the situation may be clearly apprehended by members of the committee, the Chair will read, first, the language of the paragraph and then the language of the proposed amendment. The language of the paragraph is:

Fourth. For increasing food production and eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food by education and demonstrational methods, through county, district, and urban agents and others, \$6,100,000.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] is in the following words:

That in order to further eliminate waste and to promote conservation of food, it shall be unlawful, during the existence of the war with Germany, to use any food or food materials in the manufacture or preparation of alcoholic beverages.

In order to ascertain whether or not this amendment is germane to the paragraph, it becomes necessary to determine the purport, and effect of the matter proposed to be amended. If the paragraph had concluded with the word "food" in line 25, so that it would read as follows:

For increasing food production and eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food, \$6,100,000—

there would be no doubt in the mind of any member of the committee that the amendment would be absolutely in order. But that is not the paragraph. The paragraph in its entirety proposes to increase food production, eliminate waste, and promote conservation of food by certain indicated processes, namely, by educational and demonstrational methods, through county, district and urban agents. In other words, lecturers are to be sent out to instruct the public with respect to their farming activities and the household arts so that in the result production will be increased, waste will be eliminated, and food will be conserved. If it was proposed by the amendment that some of the money which is appropriated should be utilized in the employment of agents to instruct the public in the folly of converting food products into alcoholic beverages for public consumption, such an amendment would be in order and in perfect harmony with the avowed purposes of the paragraph. It would come within the manifest scope and intent of this particular portion of the bill. But that is not what is intended to be done by the amendment. The amendment does not propose to educate the public, or by demonstrational methods, convince them of the folly of utilizing food products to produce alcoholic drinks, but to absolutely inhibit the use of such products for alcoholic conversion.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am inclined to think the Chairman overlooked the fact that the paragraph goes further than he says. It reads:

For increasing food production and eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food by educational and demonstrational methods, through county, district, and urban agents and others.

Just what "others" means there may be a little uncertain. There is one thing certain, and that is that you can not say that it refers to other agents, because the language used is "through county, district, and urban agents," which would include all classes of agents. It means other methods. Then, if the Chair will pardon me a moment, the very fact that it enumerates the methods by which these proposed conservations of food should be attained, namely, by educational methods, does not preclude its accomplishment by other and similar means and other agencies. For an instance, the rule is, if you authorize the construction of one public building, we will say, in New York City, that will be restricted to New York City, and, according to the Chairman's construction, will preclude an amendment constructing buildings elsewhere; but if you have a bill for the construction of public buildings in New York City and Cincinnati, we might add 40 other places, because the general proposition is to construct public buildings, and the place has nothing to do with it. The general proposition of this paragraph is to conserve food and prevent waste, and therefore, because it says by educational and demonstrational methods, does not preclude other methods that may be used to accomplish the same results.

The CHAIRMAN. If the paragraph carried the meaning suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], then of course the relevancy, or the germaneness of the amendment would be apparent. But the Chair does not think that it can be successfully maintained that the chief purpose of this paragraph is to increase food production, eliminate waste and promote the conservation of food. If that was the chief purpose of the paragraph then it would end with the word "food" in line 25, thereby rendering possible an infinite variety of methods to accomplish the purposes indicated. Eliminate the words providing the methods by which production is to be increased, waste eliminated and food is to be conserved, and the amendment of the gentleman from California would be plainly germane and in

order. But the committee evidently did not intend that the department should have free rein to accomplish the results intended, and secure the elimination of waste by any means that seemed good to them. Hence the use of the restrictive language confining the activities of the department to certain indicated lines of accomplishment. The one and only meaning of the paragraph therefore is to provide the means whereby the results intended may be secured on certain restricted lines of endeavor. The Agricultural Department is "cabin'd, cribb'd, confined," so to say, to the restricted paths of activity marked out for them to pursue.

As to the suggested meaning of the word "others," it occurs to the Chair that this word ought to be interpreted to mean "other educational and demonstrational methods," in view of the general meaning of the paragraph. For instance bulletins might be sent out. It is perfectly true that a general subject may be amended by a specific subject of the same character, but the amendment of the gentleman from California is not a specific subject of this general subject. This amendment does not propose to eliminate waste, to increase food products, or to promote conservation by any educational process, but is a flat legislative inhibition upon certain practices. Therefore it is not a specific subject of the same character as the general subject. The general subject is to increase food production, and so forth, by educational and demonstrational methods.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the Chair permit me to interrupt him again?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. I feel very certain the Chair is mistaken about the purposes of the paragraph. The sole purpose of the paragraph is "for increasing food production and eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food." Now, that is the intent, purpose, and object of the legislation. The method by which it is to be done as set out here is "by educational and demonstrational methods, through county, district, and urban agents, and others." But the whole object and intent to be accomplished by the legislation is that of conserving food and preventing waste, and it merely directs here by what particular way it may be done; and that being true, it becomes apparent you can add any other similar method to accomplish the same result.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not agree with the gentleman from Arkansas in that view of the paragraph. The methods indicated are not illustrative of what may be done, but are restrictive, confining the expenditure of the money appropriated to them, and them only. The department could not expend this money otherwise than as indicated, namely, on educational and on demonstrational methods. The suggestion has been made that certain legislation in this bill has been made in order by the rule, and that this amendment would be in order to this legislation. In this connection the Chair will say that if there is any legislation in this bill, made in order by the rule, to which this amendment would be proper, relevant, and germane, then the amendment can be offered when that legislation is reached, and will then be in order. This matter has been very earnestly argued by gentlemen who have taken a different view of the meaning of the paragraph from that held by the Chair. If their interpretation of the paragraph is correct, then the Chair will admit that the amendment is in order. Hence the propriety of the ruling on this point depends upon the meaning proper to be imputed to the paragraph. In that view it might be well to take an appeal from the decision of the Chair so as to afford the opportunity for full discussion of the paragraph on the appeal, and thereby secure an authoritative disposition of this question by the committee itself. The Chair has sought to set out in full the reasons for the conclusion reached and in view of that conclusion is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, after the figures "\$6,100,000," insert: "No part of this appropriation shall be available for any purpose unless there shall have been previously issued the proclamation authorized by section 15 of the act of August 10, 1917, entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the transportation of agricultural products,' such proclamation being the prohibition of the use of foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds in the production of malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph under consideration. Further, that it is new legislation that is not germane to the bill.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I simply suggest that it is a limitation upon the appropriation. The points of order which

have been made by different gentlemen contained the assertion that this is an appropriation bill. The amendment which I offer is simply a limitation upon the appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. While the Chair is reading the amendment I wish merely to direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that this amendment involves substantive law. While it is in the form of a limitation it is nevertheless a mandatory direction that compels the President to do something under the authorization of a law where his power is discretionary. First, it is well recognized that if there is a limitation that though in form negative carries affirmative legislation it violates the principle of true limitation and is legislation in its fundamental character.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. RANDALL. What legislation does the amendment carry?

Mr. STAFFORD. It refers to the provision of the food bill where—

Mr. RANDALL. It refers to legislation but does not carry it.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). Where discretion is lodged in the President whether he shall permit the utilization—

Mr. RANDALL. But the amendment does not carry legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). Whether he shall permit the use of grain in the manufacture of malt beverages.

Mr. RANDALL. The amendment does not carry any legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. The legislation is that the gentleman makes mandatory what in another law is permissive and to that extent it is legislation.

Mr. RANDALL. The amendment does not carry anything mandatory.

Mr. STAFFORD. It does indeed. You can not in the form of a negation in a limitation embody legislation which in effect is affirmative in its real purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. A different principle from that of germaneness is involved in the point of order to this amendment. If the Chair understands the amendment it is intended as a limitation on the payment of any money under this paragraph until the President has issued a certain indicated proclamation which in his discretion he may or may not issue. This amendment does not compel him to issue it, but so long as it is unissued the House does not propose, if the amendment is adopted, to allow the Agricultural Department to have the benefit of the appropriation in this paragraph. In other words the amendment proposes to utilize the right of the House to appropriate, or not to appropriate, in its discretion, to an object authorized by law. This of course is the fundamental principle upon which this amendment must depend.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chairman will permit—

The CHAIRMAN. In a moment. This amendment does not compel the President to issue the proclamation referred to. He may issue it or refuse to issue it in his discretion. But the amendment in substance says to the Department of Agriculture, We propose to withhold from you the benefit of this appropriation during the full period of time during which this proclamation is unissued. That may be a very unreasonable ground for the House to take, but after all is not this question merely one of competency or power resting upon our authority to refuse or award an appropriation? If we choose to withhold it, who is to say nay to us? We can be unreasonable if we choose to be unreasonable.

The matter proposed to be dealt with is an appropriation of money, and this body has the absolute power to determine whether it will or will not appropriate. In the exercise of that power we may do unreasonable things, arbitrary things, whimsical and absurd things, but after all the question is whether, with respect to the action proposed, we are within our powers and within our rules—in a word, whether this is a limitation, in a parliamentary sense, on an appropriation bill. The Chair is not altogether certain, in his own mind, that this amendment, in the form submitted, is strictly and technically a limitation, and being in doubt he resolves that doubt in favor of the amendment and remits the same to the determination of the committee.

Mr. RANDALL. It may be very well remembered, Mr. Chairman, that the House of Representatives did not, in the first place, pass the food-control act and therein give the President the power at his discretion to issue this proclamation; the House of Representatives made that prohibition itself, and afterwards, through the conference committee and the action of another body, the action of this House was nullified.

Now, the proposition here is to limit the expenditure of certain money, not for the purpose of general agriculture or the various purposes named in this bill but for the purpose of con-

serving food and eliminating waste of food; and the proclamation that it is desired to have issued bears directly upon that question.

The most astounding thing connected with the food situation in this country is the failure of the Food Administration to act in the matter of grains and sugar used in the manufacture of beer. With an intensive campaign of spying into the flour barrel and the sugar bowl of every family in America, the wholesale loss of food through the operations of the breweries, nine-tenths of whose product is German owned and made, becomes a positive scandal.

Mr. Hoover admits that the brewers are using to-day 42,000,000 bushels of barley, over 2,000,000 bushels of rice, and over 10,000,000 bushels of corn annually and millions of pounds of sugar in the manufacture of beer, and all of this, Mr. Chairman, is undoubtedly a waste not only of the food products but of the fuel and transportation facilities of the country.

I wish to refer here to the following, which shows how one brewery is wasting grain, labor, transportation, and man power:

A 1912 advertisement of the Anheuser-Busch Brewery declared that this brewery at that time covered 140 acres of ground and occupied 110 buildings. The details showing the enormous waste are as follows: Capacity: Brewing capacity, 2,500,000 barrels per year; malting capacity, 2,000,000 bushels per year; bottling works, 1,000,000 bottles daily; grain storage elevator, 1,750,000 bushels; stock houses (for lagging), 600,000 barrels; steam power plant, 12,000 horsepower; electric power plant, 4,000 horsepower; refrigerator plant, 4,000 tons per day; ice plant, 1,200 tons per day; coal used, 325 tons per day.

Freight: Inbound and outbound, 50,000 cars per year. Transportation facilities: Refrigerator freight cars, 1,500; horses at home plant, 143; wagons at home plant, 78; auto trucks at home plant, 74; horses at branches, 483; wagons at branches, 430; auto trucks at branches, 47.

Employees: At St. Louis plant, 6,000 people; at 36 branches, 1,500 people.

Total sales, 1911, 1,527,832 barrels. Budweiser bottled beer sales, 1911, 173,184,600 bottles.

Six million people have petitioned this Congress to enact war prohibition. Congress can not longer evade its plain duty in this matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DUPRE). The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not know how many gentlemen wish to speak on the amendment, but I would like to have a little time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, would it be asking too much to take an hour for debate on this amendment? It is a very important question. I think there will be a number of Members coming in who will desire time.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently to the prepared speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] on his amendment that would prevent all activity on the part of the Agricultural Department, so far as the present item is concerned, unless the President and the Food Administrator would change their position in the administration of a certain provision of the food-survey law.

This amendment can be considered only in one attitude, and that is a direct reflection and criticism of the President of the United States in the administration of the authority that was granted him as to the control of food in the manufacture of maltous beverages. The President has control of that situation in a practical way. He has reduced the amount of alcoholic content in maltous beverages; he has reduced the amount of alcoholic content that may be utilized in beer or near beer; and now it rests with the gentleman from California, who, I assume, pretends to be a friend of the administration, to come here and direct a slap at the President in his administration of this most troublesome question.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. RANDALL. The President has a new champion in the House. Now, I resent the language that the gentleman uses. There is no direct slap at the President. This paragraph provides—

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield further. This is a reflection, a direct reflection, upon the President in the solution of one

of the most knotty problems he has had to contend with, as to what should be the policy of the Government so far as the control of the manufacture of maltous beverages is concerned.

In the few minutes at my disposal I can not review the arguments that have justified the President and also those who have supported this policy, but if you wish here now to renew it let it be known broadcast, let it be known in your district, that you are not 100 per cent with the President, and that on this question here you want to do something that, in his judgment, will create dissension and dissatisfaction among the industrial workers of the country.

I am not in the confidence of the President, but I have heard it stated that the reason why the President has not forbidden the manufacture of beer absolutely is because it would create dissension among the industrial workers of the country. Are you willing to accept his decision in this critical moment that it is for the benefit of the industrial welfare of the country, the peace and quiet of the industrial workers, to have control of the alcoholic content of maltous beverages, or are you in favor at this minute of driving the President to stop instantly the use of grains in the further manufacture of maltous beverages, when you know there is only a three months' supply on hand, and thereby force the public to the stronger drinks—the whisky and wines and other strong alcoholic drinks?

We all know there is a large supply of wines in the State of California, from which the gentleman comes, that can be utilized for years and years. There is a large supply of whisky on hand, but so far as beer is concerned, which is an almost nonintoxicating beverage, you would exhaust the present supply within a few weeks and force the drinking population to go to the drinking of the harder liquor, that which is more devitalizing, that about which the public is protesting more and more every day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly content to leave this great problem in the hands of the President. He has solved it in a practical way. The country is not complaining of his solution of it. He has reduced the amount of alcoholic content that may be used in the manufacture of beer now to 2½ per cent, I believe. In Canada they regard beer containing only 2½ per cent of alcohol as a temperance beverage. And throughout the country we have the light maltous beverage containing 2½ per cent and less of alcohol, but now as a fetch the few would put aside the practical solution and create dissension among industrial workers by refusing them their light beer. The alternative of their proposal is to favor whisky and bar beer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I grow a bit weary of Members always saying that the working people of this country will not work unless they are drunk. [Laughter and applause.] I resent it for them. I say now that the records will show there have been more strikes, there has been more disorder, there has been more disloyalty in those communities where whisky and beer are manufactured and drunk since this war commenced than in all other parts of this country put together. [Applause.]

When anyone here says the honest workmen of this country hold their allegiance to beer above that of their country and their flag, it simply shows—well, I will not say what I started to say. [Laughter.] It shows absolute ignorance of workmen. I will put it that way.

Then they say, "It will embarrass the President," and the gentleman who makes that statement has been opposed to more propositions that the President has wanted than any other Member of this House.

The proposition is, Is it more important to have bread or beer? If you are more in favor of men being made drunk than in having children kept in good health, then, bless your heart, vote against this amendment. It amounts to the same thing. [Applause.] The time has passed in this country and everywhere when you can say that beer or whisky are necessary for good health, or that the working people of this country will not work unless you make them drunk. The record does not bear out that assertion, and the working people will not stand for it. If you would rather protect the interests of the beer-making Germans in this country than the people who need sugar and bread, why, bless your heart, if that is where your heart lies, vote against this amendment. [Applause.]

There is no use in trying to hide behind the idea of embarrassing the President or embarrassing the workers of this country. It may be that the I. W. W. will agree with the gentleman. I do not know. [Laughter.] If any working people do, they are the only ones. [Laughter.]

Mr. OVERMYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. OVERMYER. Will the gentleman state whether or not cereals are used in the manufacture of nonintoxicating liquors such as Bevo and Pablo?

Mr. CARAWAY. I understand they are.

Mr. OVERMYER. Does the gentleman's amendment prohibit the manufacture of those things?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; anything in which any food products are used in the making or brewing of its products. I do not believe in these times of shortage of grain that people should be permitted to make millions of gallons of Bevo. I am not acquainted with it. I do not know what purpose it serves, except to make profit to somebody who brews it. I am in favor, so long as we have to have a policy of conservation—and I am willing to submit to it; I am willing to observe every rule of the Food Administration, and I am not criticizing any of them, I am complying with them all—I am willing to cut down the use of flour to one meal a day, if necessary. I am willing to do without the use of sugar, but when we ask the women and children of this country to do that I am in favor of saying to the beer drinkers and whisky drinkers, "If you are not willing yourselves to help conserve the food supply, we will enact a law that will make you join the women and children of this country in helping to conserve food products." I hope the amendment will prevail. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, the prohibitionists, it appears to me, become very unreasonable when they come to discuss the food bills that are presented in this House. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] attempts to restrict the expenditure of the money appropriated in this bill, those expenditures having nothing whatever to do with the question of prohibition.

Gentlemen of the House will remember that when the food-control bill was presented this question was debated at length, both here and in the other body, and after the debate and the discussion section 15 of the bill was written. It provided for absolute prohibition of the manufacture of whisky. It provided further that—

Whenever the President shall find that limitation, regulation, or prohibition of the use of foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds in the production of malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes, or that reduction of the alcoholic content of any such malt or vinous liquors is essential in order to assure an adequate and continuous supply of food, or that the national security and defense will be subserved thereby he is authorized, from time to time, to prescribe and give public notice of the extent of the limitation, regulation, prohibition, or reduction so necessitated.

I have stated on this floor that, as far as I am concerned, although I do not believe in legislating prohibition on to people, but believe in leaving it to them to decide, that during this war, if those in charge said that the foodstuffs of the country were needed to make bread, I would vote to close up every distillery and every brewery in the United States. This Congress in passing upon this question decided that the fairest thing to do was to put the power in the hands of the President to say when that time had come.

The gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from California are willing to trust in the hands of the President the lives of all our boys, willing to leave to him the control of all the finances, but they are not willing to leave in his hands the power to pass upon the question of prohibition. That is all that the amendment of the gentleman from California does. By his amendment he says, in effect, that the President can not consider the interests of all the people in this country on this question, that he must be tied down by the action of this Congress, and that we will not leave in his hands the power that we voted him when we passed the food-control bill.

Now, I believe it should be left where the law has placed it, and if the administration believes the restriction is necessary there is no doubt that the order will be issued. I believe, with all due respect to the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Arkansas, that the Food Administration and the President of the United States know just as much about the condition of affairs in this country as those gentlemen know, and that if, in their judgment, it is wise and necessary, considering all the circumstances, to have this restriction, the order will be issued by the President. I hope the House will not go on record in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from California. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, section 15 of the act of August 10, 1917, provides that—

Whenever the President shall find that limitation, regulation, or prohibition of the use of foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds in the production of malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes, or that reduc-

tion of the alcoholic content of any such malt or vinous liquor is essential in order to assure an adequate and continuous supply of food, or that the national security and defense will be subserved thereby, he is authorized, from time to time, to prescribe and give public notice of the extent of the limitation, regulation, prohibition, or reduction so necessitated.

The bill before us authorizes the expenditure of \$6,000,000 for the purpose of sending folks out over the country to encourage the production of cereals and other agricultural products. The amendment now before us provides that this expenditure shall not be made, these people shall not be so employed, unless the President, in his wisdom, issues the proclamation of prohibition which the act of August 10 gives him authority to issue. And why not? If the President, in his wisdom or in his judgment, is of the opinion that it is not wise to save millions of bushels of grain for the use of the people, for the use of the allies, and thus aid in winning the great struggle in which we are engaged—if he does not deem it wise to do that, why should Congress spend \$6,000,000 of the people's money sending people out to encourage the production of agricultural products to be used in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors? [Applause.] I do not know what the President may determine. For one I would not be disposed to advise the President in the matter, but I do believe that unless the President deems it wise to prevent the waste of these agricultural products in the manufacture of products that muddle men's brains, in the manufacture of beverages that reduce the efficiency of the men that use them—unless the President deems it wise to do that we should not ask the people to pay taxes into the Federal Treasury and buy liberty bonds for the purpose of hiring folks to go around and encourage production in these agricultural products to be used for such purposes.

It is a question of national efficiency, a question of national sobriety, a question as to whether or not we are to spend the people's money to encourage production to be used and utilized for a purpose harmful in its effects on the people and reducing their capacity and energy in the winning of the war.

Now, gentlemen, we have been called upon from the beginning of this great struggle to do our utmost to help win the war, to help insure a great and glorious victory. Here is an opportunity to put your declarations into practice and make it clear and definite that you desire to have done that which will have a more beneficial and useful and helpful effect in the winning of the war than anything that can be done by the Congress at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the prohibition amendment, I voted for prohibition in Alaska, and I voted the other day for prohibition in the Hawaiian Islands. I belong to a prohibition family; all my instincts and bringing up are in favor of prohibition and temperance; but I think a proposition like this, to hold up the President, force him to do something he may not think wise to do at this time, on pain of refusing to the farmers demonstrational farm-bureau and educational work to which they are entitled, is outrageous. It seems to me that we ought to be willing to trust the President of the United States in this matter.

He has the power to prohibit the use of these food products for the making of malt and vinous liquors if he thinks it wise and is necessary. He asked Congress in the last session not to pass such legislation as this. Let him take his time and settle this matter, if it is necessary to settle it. He has the responsibility of deciding how the grain is to be apportioned out, and he knows how the supply is holding out. We do not know, and when he thinks it is necessary to issue a proclamation stopping further making of beer and wine I do not believe that he will have any hesitation about doing it.

I shall vote for the appropriation for farm bureaus and other demonstration work on its merits, and I do not believe in forcing the President either to cut off this appropriation or to issue a proclamation which he may not think timely. I know that some Republicans will vote for this amendment as a "good joke on the President" coming from a Democratic source or to "put the President in a hole," but I decline to be a party to any such scheme.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the time was limited, but five minutes was reserved for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]. I do not see him present. If he is not present, I do not see any reason why the gentleman should not occupy his time, if the Chair sees fit to recognize him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may occupy the time reserved for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], who is not on the floor. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am getting sick and tired, every time the prohibition question comes before this body, of hearing some one stand on this floor and say that the reason the President has not given us prohibition is because the workingmen of this country do not want it. I say it is an insult to the workingmen of this country for any one to stand here and say that they are opposed to prohibition. As I stated only a few weeks ago on the floor of this House, the great industrial State of Ohio, the third largest industrial State in the Union, with its thousands and thousands of workingmen in its factories, shops, and mills, voted dry by a large majority. If you leave out Cincinnati and Hamilton County, the State of Ohio went dry by over 55,000 majority. I want to say if the liquor traffic depended on the working classes of our country it would go out of existence in six months. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] pleads with us to stand by the President and defeat this amendment. As far as standing by the President is concerned, I want to say that there is no man in this House who has stood any closer to the President during this crisis than I. I have supported him on every single proposition that he has advocated. Partisan politics has been cast aside by me, and I have stood by the great President of the United States, and intend to stand by him until this great crisis is over. [Applause.] But I am not so sure as to whether or not I ought to smother my convictions upon this great prohibition question simply because the President of the United States does not agree with me. For I believe that in standing for prohibition I am advocating a great war measure which will help us defeat Germany. Some time ago this House, by an overwhelming majority, passed a law which prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquors to soldiers and sailors.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Not now. Why did you pass that law? Because you thought it would impair their efficiency. If intoxicating liquor is a bad thing for the soldiers and sailors, why is it not a bad thing for our workingmen in the shops and factories who have to make the ammunition and the guns with which the soldiers fight? Then, again, what a farce it is to ask the brave mothers of the country who have given their sons to go to the front to fight this battle to conserve food and fill their cellars full of corn meal and other kind of dope in order to save wheat and still let the brewers of the country use thousands and thousands of tons of foodstuffs in the manufacture of a nonessential intoxicating liquor. [Applause.] I read in the paper just yesterday that in a few days Mr. Hoover is going to call a wheat day all over the United States. He is going to have big meetings in the schoolhouses, in the theaters, any place where they can get a meeting, and have some one address the meeting and ask the women of the country to conserve foodstuffs, especially wheat. It is a farce, I say, to ask these brave women who are doing their best to conserve the food of the country and then allow the brewers to use up the foodstuffs in the manufacture of beers and wines. We have had embargoes placed upon the shipment of certain commodities on the railroads, embargoes on the shipment of automobiles, on building material, on the shipment of other products, and yet the brewers of the country to-day are using more cars on the railroads to haul their products—their beer and the grain used in the manufacture of beer—than all of the iron and steel industries of the United States are using at this time. I shall support the amendment. I believe it is in keeping with the principle which ought to be in the heart of every true American—to win the war and to defeat Germany. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the question presented by the last speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], is not in issue upon this occasion. This prohibition issue is not involved, because everybody knows this amendment if adopted will not secure prohibition. There is no man in the House who is stronger for prohibition than I am; there is no man here who will go further than I to establish prohibition throughout this country. I am just as strong for prohibition as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], who spoke in favor of this amendment, and I am just as strong for it as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], who has just spoken.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I regret very much that I have not the time to yield to my good friend. I have only five minutes. If this was a straight prohibition amendment proposed upon the floor of this House or a straight prohibition bill proposed on the floor of this House I should certainly vote for it. I have voted for every moral proposition and every prohibition and temperance amendment or bill that has been offered in Congress ever since I have been a Member of this body, and will continue to do so so long as I remain here. When I came

here there was a saloon in this Capitol. I voted to exclude it from the Capitol, and it was excluded, and I have voted for every prohibition measure presented. What is this amendment? This amendment says that "no part of this appropriation shall be available for any purpose until the President shall have previously issued a proclamation authorized by section 15 of the act of August 10, 1917, entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture,'" and so forth. In other words, you propose to say to the President of the United States, you propose to walk up to the White House and look him in the eye and say to him, "Mr. President, until you issue your proclamation you shall not have a dollar to run the work provided for in this paragraph for the Agricultural Department of this Government."

Mr. RANDALL. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman wants to be fair—

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes; I want to be and will be fair, but I decline to yield, because I have not the time. Under this appropriation we provide for home economics, for county agents in the North and West, for extension agricultural work in the Northern and Western States, and for boys' and girls' clubs, and for demonstration work and extension agricultural work in the Southern States, for county agents, for boys' clubs, for home demonstration work in the Southern States. These are the provisions now under consideration. This is the work you propose to stop until you can force and compel the President to issue his proclamation provided for in the act referred to in the amendment proposed.

You propose by the adoption of this amendment to go up to the President of the United States and say to him, "Until you issue your proclamation we propose to stop the agricultural industries in the United States and activities of the Agricultural Department provided for in this paragraph of the bill carrying an appropriation of \$6,100,000." Do you believe that you can hurry the President in issuing that proclamation one single minute or one single hour or one single day by withholding money for the activities of any part of this great department or any other department of the Government? You can not coerce the President, and he will issue that proclamation whenever he believes that circumstances justify it and not before. Whenever he comes to the conclusion himself that it is required by the conditions existing in the United States of America, and it will help to win this war, he will issue it and not before. This is simply an effort to say to the President, and it does say to him in so many words, "You shall issue that proclamation which you have the right to issue now." He can issue it this very minute if he sees proper to issue it, but this says to him, "You shall issue it now, and unless you do issue it we will withhold this appropriation for the Department of Agriculture." Do you think you can get anywhere with President Woodrow Wilson by a proposition of that kind? If you think so, you are badly mistaken in the man and have another think coming to you. You can not coerce him and make him do anything his wise judgment does not approve. You will simply delay the cause instead of hurrying it. Gentlemen, if you want to take that position, you take it, and you will be responsible for it. I am willing to trust Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States, and the people of the United States are willing to trust him, in reference to this matter. If you do not believe the people trust him implicitly, you put it up to them and you will find out maybe to your sorrow. Some say, "You have stood by him." Yes; I have stood by him. I am standing by him here now and I am going to stand by him, and we will win this war and put Germany to flight and destroy the autocracy of the world. [Applause.] I am going to stand by him till the end of time, if he lives that long and I live that long, before I shall turn aside from the accomplishment of that great purpose which I hope and believe we all have. [Applause.] You propose to say to him that he shall issue the proclamation. The law is plain, he knows what it is, and he will do his duty, and you can not impress it upon him more strongly by the passage of this amendment. I am willing to defer to his good judgment and wise counsel—are you? This is not a real prohibition proposition, because it will secure no results and you know it. It is simply an amendment to put up to the President and say to him, "We command you and you shall obey." If you do not obey, we take from you the money provided in this paragraph of the bill.

You are mistaken in the President if you think for one moment you can drive him to do what his conscience and judgment does not approve. As I said at the outset, if it were a prohibition bill, if it were a real prohibition amendment which would secure results, if it were upon a bill where it ought to be, and

which would bring about prohibition, I would vote for it, as I know would many other Members of the House. You know and I know that this amendment will not accomplish prohibition and aid that cause which I have fought for and voted for since I was 21 years old, and I refuse to ride a "wooden horse" and make a play in an effort to deceive somebody by trying to make them believe this is a real prohibition amendment when I know and you know it is not. You can not deceive the people, and I am not going to join you in an effort to do so. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one-half of a minute.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. We can not extend it, the time has been closed—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have been absent on a committee meeting and have not heard the amendment. I would like to hear it read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANDALL. If this amendment is adopted, do I understand that it will apply only to the restriction of the appropriations named in the fourth paragraph and to no other portion of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry; it is a matter of legislative interpretation.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. RANDALL) there were—ayes 57, yeas 52.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers (Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi and Mr. RANDALL) reported that there were—ayes 60, yeas 58.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fifth. For gathering authoritative information in connection with the demand for, and the production, supply, distribution, and utilization of food, and otherwise carrying out the purposes of section 2 of the act; extending and enlarging the market news service; and preventing waste of food in storage, in transit, or held for sale; advise concerning the market movement or distribution of perishable products; for enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect and certify perishable agricultural products, as provided in the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, \$2,136,028.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUTCHINSON: Page 3, line 13, after the word "nineteen," insert "for the following-stated purposes and in amounts as follows: Market news service on fruits and vegetables, \$500,000; market news service on live stock and meats, \$300,000; market news service on butter, cheese, eggs, and poultry, \$164,000; market news service on grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, \$180,720; food and fertilizer survey of the United States, \$449,700; conservation of food products in transportation and storage, \$229,937; market inspection of perishable foods, \$51,000; city market service, \$66,131; direct market activities, \$85,100; special market activities, \$109,440; total, \$2,136,028."

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much debate? We have had debate on this over and over again, and I am anxious to get along as much as possible. How much debate does the gentleman think we should have?

Mr. HAUGEN. We want about 25 minutes on this side.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Could not you get along with a little less than that?

Mr. HAUGEN. Thirty minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That is getting worse. I do not think we ought to take that much time. We have had extended discussion on this proposition on all the items preceding this, and it looks to me as if we could get on a little bit faster. I do not want to hurry anybody or cut anybody off, but I feel that gentlemen on that side ought to help me in getting along.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to suggest to the gentleman that this is a very large item, and one of the most important items in the bill.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Say 25 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Thirty-five minutes on this side.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Thirty minutes on a side?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Twenty-five minutes. I have given the gentleman 25 minutes, and only take 5 here.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have a request for 30 minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Make it 35 minutes. Mr. Chairman, I make the request in this form: I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto and on the paragraph close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto and all amendments to amendments shall terminate at the expiration of 35 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Will the gentleman from Mississippi now give the Chair a list of the gentleman whom he is to recognize?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa to give a list of the names over there. I reserve five minutes for myself.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], five minutes; to Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, five minutes; to Mr. YOUNG of Texas, five minutes; to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON], five minutes; to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], five minutes; to Mr. MORGAN, of Oklahoma, five minutes; and take five minutes for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman that that will make 40 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the suggestion to the chairman of the committee that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] be allowed to control 30 minutes of the time.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Let the gentleman distribute the time and divide 5 minutes of it. Let him take 25 minutes and give us 10.

Mr. HAUGEN. Make it 30 minutes on this side, and you can take whatever you want.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That will leave me five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time as computed here amounts to 40 minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Unanimous consent was granted for 35 minutes, 30 to be used on that side and 5 minutes on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will control 30 minutes for himself and his associates, to suit himself, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is to have five minutes?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That is right.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, there is some excuse for lump-sum appropriations in a strictly war bill, a bill appropriating money for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or for any strictly military or naval purpose, but there is no excuse for lump-sum appropriations in an Agricultural appropriation bill. It will not aid or comfort the enemy to know exactly how much money is appropriated for specific agricultural purposes. There is absolutely no excuse for giving lump-sum appropriations to the Agricultural Department to be used as they see fit. It is an unwise policy to make lump-sum appropriations at any time.

There is a bill pending in the Committee on Rules providing for a budget system, or appropriations by one committee, and nothing has occurred in this House that is so forceful an argument in favor of taking the power of appropriations away from all other committees and placing it in one committee as this action on the part of the Committee on Agriculture. And I serve notice now that from this day on no member of any committee that makes appropriations here can get very far with me in arguing for a retention of the power of making appropriations in individual committees.

The action of the Committee on Agriculture in making lump-sum appropriations in this bill has made the final argument in favor of one appropriating committee and of a budget system. From this on I shall favor on this floor and in every place where it will be of any value the budget system—one appropriating committee—so that we shall not have duplication of appropriations, as we are having in this bill. Why, the Committee on Agriculture is duplicating appropriations here for the various activities of the Department of Agriculture. There is not an item in this bill that could not properly have been included in the regular Agricultural appropriation bill, because they are all akin and simply adding to and multiplying appropriations for the same purpose. The House would not have made the appropriations as large as this bill will make them in the aggregate.

At a time when we are appealing to the people for money from all sources, reckless appropriations are being made. This is reckless, but it would not be so bad if Members knew exactly what the money was to be used for and if the country knew what it was to be used for. But here are \$6,000,000 to be placed in the hands of a bureau chief or of the Secretary of Agriculture to be used—

Mr. RUBEY. Two million dollars in this section.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Two in this section, six in the former section, other amounts in other sections, and, in all, \$18,000,000. Every purpose should have been itemized. The gentlemen on the Committee on Agriculture will find that their action in this may result at a very early day in sufficiently arousing the Members of this House to respond to an intelligent demand that has been coming from the country for many years for a budget system in the United States. [Applause.] And the Committee on Agriculture will probably not have the opportunity of bringing many more appropriation bills upon the floor of this House. For one, I shall favor the budget system and the inauguration of it at the earliest date possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman from South Carolina will occupy the time that I have.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if anybody should be frightened by looks or voice the Committee on Agriculture would be badly frightened at this moment. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] says that this bill is a wasteful expenditure of public money. I venture to assert that the gentleman from Kansas has not read this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, I have read it very, very carefully, and analyzed it.

Mr. LEVER. I am very glad the gentleman has done that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I opposed the rule to bring it upon the floor after examining the bill very carefully.

Mr. LEVER. The great State of Kansas, one of the greatest agricultural States in this Union, I am sure will appreciate the position of the gentleman from Kansas in opposing a rule here to make in order an appropriation for the encouragement of agricultural production in this country in time of war.

The complaint has been made here frequently, and with some degree of justification, that it would have been better if each of these larger items had been segregated into smaller ones.

I want to reiterate what I said yesterday, that this bill follows the exact language verbatim of the food-production act of August 10, 1917, which the gentleman from Kansas voted for, and there were only five votes cast in this body against it. More than that, there is no provision in this act, as in the regular appropriation act, by which a certain percentage of one appropriation may be carried to another appropriation to meet an emergency that may arise.

Let us see what this situation may be. We had a lot of talk yesterday about cottage cheese, a little appropriation of \$52,000. That is carried in a lump-sum appropriation in which the work against hog cholera, contagious abortion, and other animal diseases are carried. Now, suppose the Secretary of Agriculture finds an unusual outbreak of hog cholera in the country; suppose he finds an unusual situation with respect to some other animal disease. Are we to limit him under those circumstances to a certain sum here, or shall we give him the privilege of saying, "I will take the \$52,000 that I have asked the committee to give me for work with respect to cottage cheese, and I will put it into the fund for fighting hog cholera"? Because the vital thing under the circumstances is the eradication of hog cholera, the vital thing is the fighting of blackleg, the vital thing is the fighting of contagious abortion, the vital thing is doing something else.

You do not want, in an emergency appropriation of this kind, to tie the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture hard and fast to any one small item in this bill. If we were bringing in the Agricultural appropriation bill; providing for the ordinary routine work of the Department of Agriculture, I should agree with the gentleman from Kansas in his contention.

And I would say to the gentleman from Kansas that there is not a committee in this House which so minutely itemizes its regular appropriation bill as the Committee on Agriculture, and that work has been progressing year by year, because I recall—and my friend from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] will bear me out—that when we first became members of the Committee on Agriculture practically every item in it was an aggregate sum, a big sum, and it has been the Committee on Agriculture that has set the pace in this House for itemizing appropriations. But I think there is not a sane man in this House who can not see the difference between a regular appropriation bill, providing for the doing of routine work, regularly organized work,

and an emergency appropriation bill which is attempting to speed up the activities of the Department of Agriculture along the lines of production and the elimination of waste in this country. The man who can not see that distinction to my mind has a mind so dull that he can not see anything. I am sure the gentleman from Kansas, good friend as he is of mine, will, in the light of this proposition, regret his terrific onslaught on the Committee on Agriculture. I hope by now that this proposition of the segregation of these items may once and for all time in this House and in the consideration of this bill be settled. We have beaten every proposition looking to it since this bill has been under consideration and have taken up the time of busy Members here by the renewal of a fight in which the proposition has been whipped repeatedly on this floor. Let us go forward. You have made a fight, and a good fight, but you have been licked, and you ought to take your licking like good men, and I believe you are going to do it. I hope this amendment will not prevail. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHACKLEFORD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of ambushes and camouflages hereabouts that ought to be exposed. [Laughter.] My eloquent young friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who is soon to be transplanted to other fields of usefulness [applause], and whom we will very greatly regret to lose, is adroit as well as capable. He insists that because most of us voted for the legislation on which these appropriations are based, therefore we should vote for any sort of an appropriation carrying out the purposes of that bill that may be presented by anyone.

Well, my friend is a logical man, and he knows that that does not necessarily follow. We favored the legislation, but it is not necessary to drain the Treasury to put it into effect. Because we think the appropriations asked for under the bill are exorbitant and wickedly extravagant is not an argument against the legislation, and the fact we seek to bring the items within reason can not properly be tortured into opposition to the legislation or the carrying out of its provisions.

The gentleman argues that as what is done here in the way of lump-sum appropriations is what was done in the original bill, and the appropriation it carried, therefore, having started with a lump sum, we should go on with lump sums. Well, every man in this House who is not a mere novice—and the gentleman who made this argument certainly is not—realizes that in the inauguration of an activity, in the beginning of an activity, it is quite frequently necessary to lump the appropriations until the organization shall have been perfected, when the Congress always proceeds, if it is wise, to segregate the items; and the time has come for the segregation of the items under this bill.

Another camouflage that is popular here and hereabouts is that every item carried in an agricultural appropriation bill is something done for the farmer. The idea sought to be conveyed is that you are in making the appropriations doing something for the horny-handed son of toil, and it is further urged that as long as we are blowing our money for booming guns and battle-ships and what not, why not do something for the farmer, the agriculturist, the tiller of the soil? There is not a penny of the more than \$2,000,000 sought to be appropriated under this item that will ever be paid to any farmer [applause], and there is not a penny of it the spending of which will necessarily benefit any farmer. Under this item you are proposing to secure information more or less necessary, more or less informing, more or less essential, as to where agricultural products are to be found.

It is a food-survey proposition, and if we do not get any further along with it and do not get any more real information out of it than we ordinarily do out of that sort of investigation, then we will have wasted \$2,000,000 of good money of the heavily taxed people of this country, paying somebody who ought to be engaged in a productive enterprise to do a wholly useless and inconsequential thing. That is all there is to that. It is not \$2,000,000 to the farmer or for the benefit of the farmer. It is \$2,000,000 in the spending of which, if we benefit anyone at all, we are to benefit the men who use the farmers' products by telling him how much there is of it and where it is to be found. This old guff about voting enormous appropriations because being on an Agricultural bill they are going to help the farmer is ridiculous when the facts are considered, and we ought not hear that kind of alleged argument from gentlemen who ought to know better. My opinion is that there is no necessity for the kind of investigation or inquiry herein proposed. The Food

Commission by reason of its organization, activities, and its duties must be informed with regard to the agricultural products and production of the country with regard to all things proposed to be inquired into here. The Food Commission has gone into these matters carefully and thoroughly and will continue to do so. They are getting the information for a real useful purpose in order to know to what extent it may become necessary to ask the people of the country to conserve and limit the use of food. That bureau will get all the information necessary along these lines, and in my opinion the expenditure of this \$2,000,000 will be worse than useless. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to direct attention especially to the provisions of subdivision 2 of section 1 of this bill. This is the provision which provides for the continuation of the appropriation of \$2,500,000 as provided in the act of August 10, 1917, and of the appropriation of \$4,000,000, authorized by the act of March 28, 1918, making a total of \$6,500,000 for procuring, storing, and furnishing seeds to farmers. The chief purposes of the appropriations referred to were to stimulate agriculture, to encourage increased production of food products, to enable farmers to enlarge the acreage planted and increase the amount produced on each acre. I have never had very much faith in the means adopted by Congress under the advice and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. Especially I have not had confidence that there would be any material increase of production of food products through the system adopted. The Members of the House must bear in mind that under former appropriations and under the appropriation made in this act the Secretary of Agriculture can dispose of seeds for cash only. I have contended, and I now maintain, first, that there is no demand among the farmers themselves that the Government should sell them seeds for cash. The farmers have been accustomed to purchase their own seed and perhaps in the larger number of cases to save their own seed. The farmers who have to buy seed and who have the cash to pay for it or possess the credit to enable them to buy seed do not particularly need this assistance. The farmers who have no seed, who have no cash, and who have no credit can not deal with the Secretary of Agriculture. Under the restrictions of the law he must trade with cash customers only. Now, bear in mind that the object of this appropriation and the only basis upon which it can be justified is to increase food production. It is evident to my mind that men who have the cash to pay for seed or who can borrow money from local bankers with which to secure cash to buy seed from the Government will not to any material extent increase the products of their farms merely because they can trade with the Government instead of private individuals. This appropriation therefore to my mind will fail to meet the purpose for which it is intended. It will not stimulate agriculture. It will not increase food production. It will not help us to win the war. On the other hand, the Government will be to a large expense for the payment of salaries and traveling expenses of a large number of Federal employees.

I have in my hand an article which I clipped from the Daily Oklahoman, published at Oklahoma City, in its issue of May 14, 1918. That was just one week ago to-day. It purports to give an interview from H. N. Vinall, of the Department of Agriculture emergency seed distribution. This representative of the Agriculture Department appears to apologize for the high prices the farmers are being charged for their seed. Referring to the prices, the paper represents him as saying as follows:

The prices would have been lower, Vinall declared, if the seed had been purchased later or earlier than February, because of the high prices prevailing at that time. The Government had appropriated the money during last year, he said, but money for the work in Oklahoma and Kansas became available only in February, and, due to the proximity of planting season, the seed were bought immediately.

It appears from this statement that the department did not exercise the very highest quality of business judgment. It purchased seed at a time when high prices prevailed. As a result, the farmers will pay higher prices in purchasing from the Government. Just why this fund was not available until at a time when high prices prevailed I do not know, but it is evident that the farmers who dealt with the Government suffered financial loss thereby. I was also impressed with the reasons the representative of the Agriculture Department assigned as to why the farmers should purchase from the Government. Here is what he said, according to the Oklahoman:

The farmers hardly can afford not to buy seed from the Government, both as patriots and for their own gain.

Mr. Chairman, I supposed that the farmer would be at liberty to buy from private dealers or the Government; that it would be left entirely to them; but, according to this interview, the

farmers who bought seed of the Government agent were held up as patriots. The implication might follow that those who did not buy of the Government might not be patriots. Mr. Chairman, I know nothing about the correctness of this interview; neither is it my purpose to criticize Mr. Vinall, whose name appears as a representative of the Department of Agriculture. I indeed assume that he is an intelligent, capable, efficient official, and is honestly trying to discharge his duties and is carrying out the directions and wishes of his superior officers at Washington. What I am criticizing is the policy of the Government in purchasing and selling seed to farmers and limiting those sales to the farmers who have the cash, a class which is in the least need of assistance. If the Government goes into the seed business, it should treat all farmers alike, and it should conduct its business upon a plan that will accomplish the purpose of the appropriation, namely, to insure increased food production.

The farmers may be divided into four classes—first, those who own their farms with no mortgage on them, farmers who are out of debt, who have bank accounts, who have credit, and who need no help or assistance from the National Government. They are able to buy seed from anyone. This class does not constitute 25 per cent of our farmers. Another class are the farmers who own their farms but their farms are mortgaged. They are in debt. This class constitutes about one-third of the farmers of the United States. Another class have no farms. One-third of our farmers are tenants who have no farms, mortgaged or otherwise. They are the men that need the credit. They are the men to whom the Government should furnish seed on reasonable terms. Another class of farmers are not even tenants. They are known as farm laborers. It is not the 25 per cent but the 75 per cent of farmers who should be aided. It is the tenant farmers and the farmers with mortgages upon their farms to whom the Government should sell seed on credit. By this plan the Government could largely increase food production. So if the Federal Government desires to stimulate agriculture it should help the farmer who has no cash, who has no bank account, but who is intelligent, honest, industrious, and patriotic and needs help in the way of credit, but it seems to me that the policy of the Agricultural Department results in helping those most who need help the least. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have always voted for every measure brought into the House which, in my judgment, aided the farmer in scientific farming. It is a great work and one in which the Government can do great good; but at a time when we are exacting from the people such large sums of money because of the war I think it is a great mistake for the Congress of the United States to impose greater taxes on the people for unnecessary purposes. When we passed in this House the Federal farm-loan act it was understood by every man who voted for that bill that bonds would be sold by that corporation and the money received from the sale of those bonds placed in the fund to be loaned to the farmers; it was not intended to take the money out of the Treasury of the United States to loan at all. Yet those bonds have not found purchasers, and consequently the administration has ordered to be diverted from the Treasury of the United States \$209,000,000, which money has been raised as a war fund to carry on this great war, to the Federal farm-loan bank, and it has been shown here by statistics that money has been injudiciously loaned—in some instances as much as \$10,000 loaned on a property valued at but \$7,500. That is bad management; it is a bad loan; and the money has been wrung from the people for another purpose and has been diverted. For what purpose I leave it for you to say. One gentleman said this morning on the floor of the House that it is now proposed to place in every county in every State in the Union a man to educate the farmer, and a woman in every county in every State of the Union to show the housewives how to make schmierkase—Dutch cheese—but you are calling it cottage cheese. I suppose you are afraid to call it Dutch cheese now for fear you might be considered pro-German, and you have given it the name of cottage cheese. Where in the name of goodness will you find a housewife who is a competent housewife who will leave her home and children and go out through the county and teach people how to make Dutch cheese? Where can you get women who know how to make those things who will go among the housewives of this country and educate them how to economize? My good friends, the farmers of this country, because of necessity, have learned how to economize, and I hope that you will not send some little painted and powdered lady from the city to the country to educate the housewives on the farm how to economize. Oh, what absolute nonsense to talk about such things! You are going to spend the people's money in employing whom? Somebody seeking notoriety. You remind me of the story of the fellow who wanted a divorce from his wife

because she was a suffragette. He went to a lawyer and said he must have a divorce. The lawyer asked him why, and the man said that his wife was a suffragette. The lawyer informed him that was not sufficient cause and the courts would not grant a divorce upon that ground. "But," said the man, "she is out every day, neglecting her family, attending conventions, promoting the cause of woman suffrage, and she is out every night listening to lectures. I do not object to getting my own meals, to washing my own clothes, to washing the dishes, and making up the beds, but, by heaven, when it comes to sitting up nights running little pink and blue ribbons through my night clothes to try to fool the baby I draw the line!" [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, you are seeking some other cause for the woman to be away from home and from her baby.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment to this section to increase the item by \$5,000, in order to get a market news service here in the District of Columbia. I made some remarks upon this subject a few days ago, on May 17. I think everyone here will admit that the prices for meat and vegetables are higher in Washington than anywhere else in the United States. In the estimates prepared by Director Charles J. Brand we find that a service such as I am going to propose for the District is given to several cities of the United States, some eight of them, under the emergency funds we provided last year. I was strongly impressed with Mr. Brand's statement concerning this work. One of the cities where they have this service is the city of St. Paul, which is the nearest of the eight to where I live. I want to give you the prices of meats advertised in the St. Paul Dispatch. Take the advertisement of the Broadway Meat & Provision Co. They advertise to sell veal stew at 12 cents a pound, veal shoulder roasts at 15 cents a pound, leg of veal at 17 cents a pound. If there is anyone in this room who can buy any of those articles for twice the amount in Washington, I would like him to stand up. Summer sausage is sold at 27 cents a pound, pork shoulder at 23 cents a pound, midget bacon at 28 cents a pound. Pork liver is sold at 7 cents a pound.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What is the date of that?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This is on May 3, and meats were higher in Washington on May 3, I think, than they are to-day. There are several other advertisements here. Here is one of McQuade's Market. It advertises veal roast at 23 cents a pound, loin of veal roast 28 cents a pound, shoulder of veal at 25 cents a pound, veal stew at 20 cents a pound, pork loin at 28 cents a pound, sparerib at 17 cents a pound. It seems almost impossible when you consider what we have to pay for meats here in the District of Columbia to think that in St. Paul they are selling meats for such prices. It is hard for the consumers to pay such exorbitant prices as are charged in Washington. As a rule, the farmers are blamed for the high prices, which is unjust to them. A market news service will show that the profiteering is done after the products leave the hands of the farmers.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see provision made for a market service in the city of Washington, but these appropriations are already away up in the air, and are about the only ones that I have objected to on account of the amount. Why would it not be better for the gentleman to offer a proviso that out of this money appropriated \$5,000 shall be used for the purpose he suggests?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am willing to accept that suggestion if the other members of the committee would accept it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think that would be adopted.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I have no objection to a proviso of that kind, making \$5,000 of the money appropriated available for that purpose.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That being the case, I have nothing further to say. I thank the gentlemen very much.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, our worthy and distinguished chairman has just stated that the Committee on Agriculture has always exercised great care in preparing appropriation bills in segregating the items, which is true.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. And let me state that the gentleman has helped to do that, and rendered very valuable service.

Mr. HAUGEN. I thank the gentleman; but the gentleman will also recall a year ago a bill came to our committee appropriating \$25,000,000 in a lump sum. He also will recall that the bill was referred back to the department with instructions to itemize, and that the appropriation was cut to \$18,000,000. I regret exceedingly that this great committee is going to de-

part from the rule which it has followed in the past. I believe it a good rule and one that the committee should follow. As I have said, I believe that Congress and the department are entitled to know what the money is appropriated for. Here we have an item carrying \$2,136,000; all of it can under the bill be used for one project. For instance, all of the appropriation carried in this item can, if the Bureau of Markets so determines, be used for food survey. That, of course, should not be done; certainly not unless the service can be made of more value than it has been in the past.

I read from Mr. Brand's testimony as to the food survey. Here is what he said April 27:

Yes; or December 31. The actual information on wheat, flour, stock, and other grain foods, and cereal foods generally, for April 1, is ready to release to-day.

The survey made on December 31 is ready for release the 27th of April. Of what value were those surveys, when much of the food had been consumed at the time the information was released? If we are to have surveys, we ought to have them when they are of some value, not after the foodstuffs have been consumed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee what was the appropriation for the Bureau of Markets, say a year ago, for the activities included in this item?

Mr. HAUGEN. I think they were increased last year \$155,000 more than this year. My recollection is that last year it was \$2,522,000. We started the bureau, I believe, with \$50,000, and it has kept on increasing.

Mr. STAFFORD. How long ago?

Mr. HAUGEN. Three or four years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here is an instance of a bureau created four years ago, with an initial appropriation of \$50,000, growing in that time to the extent of \$2,136,000 and furnishing information that was of no avail at all to the public generally.

Mr. HAUGEN. Just one more statement. When Mr. Brand was asked of what value this work was, among the things that he had discovered was a wreck over in Albany. I read from his statement, printed in the hearings:

Mr. WASON. Did you think, under ordinary conditions, a wreck in Albany would affect the price of beef in Boston?

Mr. BRAND. Yes.

Mr. WASON. How much?

Mr. BRAND. Two or three dollars a hundred.

Gentlemen, it is absurd. Just think of it; a little railroad wreck affecting the price of beef in the big city of Boston to the extent of two or three dollars a hundred. Gentlemen, that seems to me a reckless statement. With the money we are expending we are entitled to more reliable information. Considering it all, it seems to me that the bill ought to be referred back to the Committee on Agriculture, and that the committee should bring in a bill in the regular form—in a proper form—in order that the department may know what the money is appropriated for and that we may know exactly for what purpose this money is to be expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HUTCHINSON) there were—ayes 33, yeas 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this same section.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the Randall amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the figures, insert "Provided, That \$5,000 thereof shall be used to establish a market news service on live stock and meats in the District of Columbia."

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment at all and I ask that it be adopted. The question was taken and the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sixth. For miscellaneous items, including the salaries of assistant secretaries appointed under the act approved August 10, 1917; special work in crop estimating; aiding agencies in the various States in supplying farm labor; enlarging the informational work of the Department of Agriculture; and printing and distributing emergency leaflets, posters, and other publications requiring quick issue or large editions, \$1,105,980, of which sum not exceeding \$25,000 shall be available for rent in the District of Columbia: Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, for the official purposes of the Department

of Agriculture, and within the limits of the appropriations for rent may by this or any other act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, to requisition the use of, and take possession of, any building or any space in any building, and the appurtenances thereof, in the District of Columbia, other than a dwelling house occupied as such or a building occupied by any other branch of the United States Government; and he shall ascertain and pay just compensation for such use. If the amount of compensation so ascertained be not satisfactory to the person entitled to receive the same, such person shall be paid 75 per cent of such amount, and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as, added to said 75 per cent, will make up such amount as will be just compensation for such use in the manner provided by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 2, page 4, after the word "rent," strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof the word "made."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUTCHINSON: Page 3, line 22, after the word "edition," strike out all of lines 22 and 23 and the word "Columbia," in line 24, and insert "for the following stated purposes and in amounts as follows: Office of the Secretary, \$76,420; publication and information work, \$235,000; agricultural exhibits, \$43,020; rent in the District of Columbia, \$25,000; assistance in supplying farm labor, \$162,000; poultry and egg demonstrations, \$40,000; sirup demonstrations, \$7,000; preparation of sweet sirups, \$5,000; handling, transportation, and storage of fish, \$20,000; waterproofing leather for Government and farm use, \$3,000; serviceability tests of leather and substitutes, \$6,000; utilization of wool-scouring wastes, \$9,000; extension work in bee-keeping, \$15,000; control of noxious rodents, \$100,000; destruction of predatory animals, \$125,000; special work in crop estimates, \$234,540; total, \$1,105,980.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, let us see how much time to take on this. This is the same amendment, I understand, just simply segregates and itemizes the paragraph like the previous amendment. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does anybody want to speak on that side? If so, how many?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does the gentleman desire not to make any effort to correct this bill at all?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am opposed to correcting it in this way.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman is referring to votes that have taken place on other matters. I did not know that he might finally consent to some correction of it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am trying to state to the gentleman that I intend to stand for the bill as reported.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to suggest to the gentleman that it occurs to me that five minutes on a side is all that is necessary on this amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It occurs to me it is not.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee, I do not propose to submit any more to a time agreement here where five or six gentlemen speak on that side and only one on this side. If we are going to debate this question, let the Record show just what the House thinks about the attitude of the Members.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Regular order has been called for. The regular order is that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] has been recognized and is entitled to the floor, but pending his taking the floor he submitted to an interruption by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] in order to reach an agreement as to time. So long as that proceeds informally with the consent of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON], the Chair will not interfere.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] that the division of time came at the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi, and if that division was not satisfactory to the gentleman from Alabama it should not be charged up to this side. As far as I know, no objection has been made to time being taken on the items. Nobody is asking for anything but a square deal.

Mr. HEFLIN. "The gentleman from Alabama" has just stated that hereafter he would not agree to that method.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would it not be all right if we would take 20 minutes on this side if the gentleman from Alabama be given that much time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is in charge of the matter in this House, and he can submit any agreement that he makes informally with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and it will be submitted by the Chair.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will suggest to the gentleman that makes the statement that five minutes from me is sufficient to answer 20 minutes from that side.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Of course, Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to do is to expedite the passage of the bill, and I have always been willing to concede discussion to that side. Of course, anybody could object to any request for unanimous consent that I make. How much time does the gentleman from Iowa want?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] would like five minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] would like five minutes, making in all 10 minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Young of Texas, a member of the committee, would like five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I wish to discuss another matter entirely, that relating to commandeering, but I do not wish to be included in that agreement.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Now, then, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, 10 minutes on that side and 10 minutes on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto shall terminate at the expiration of 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, does that include the whole paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. That was not the way it was stated.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I stated, there is a different matter, the right of a department to commandeer buildings, that I think should be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] to close debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto in 20 minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Will the gentleman now indicate those who are to consume this time?

Mr. HAUGEN. On this side, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Mississippi give the Chair the names on the Democratic side?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Young of Texas and myself.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is on the same line as the rest, for the purpose of itemizing the paragraph, and I desire to call the attention of the committee to one particular item, and that is "Assistance in supplying farm labor, \$162,000." In the next paragraph, paragraph 7, we have an appropriation of \$500,000 for the benefit of the Secretary of Agriculture, for supplying labor to farmers. This is a partial duplication. The Department of Labor also has a large appropriation for this very same object of supplying labor to farmers and other industries.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Do I understand the gentleman that this covers two items for the same thing in this bill, one to be used by one party and one by another?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Both by the same party. The first is this amendment, which authorizes \$162,000 for assistance in supplying farm labor. In the next section, paragraph 7, there is \$500,000 appropriated to the Department of Agriculture for the same purpose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What excuse can there be for that?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I do not know.

Mr. RUBEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I will.

Mr. RUBEN. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the appropriation carried in the last paragraph is a separate appropriation made as a revolving fund. There is a bill pending in the Senate which might become a law. In case that should become a law, of course this item will be stricken out. The reason it was segregated and put in a separate paragraph by itself was for that purpose, in order to not interfere with the amount carried in the other paragraph in the bill, and I think that amount should be carried in that paragraph.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. May I ask the gentleman a question? If this becomes a law, how can it be withheld?

Mr. RUBEN. If this becomes a law—it has to pass the Senate, of course—and both sums are utilized, of course that amount of money will not be used. If this is stricken out, and if you put it all in one paragraph and that paragraph is stricken out, they would be left without any money to do this work. For that reason the department asks that the amount be kept

in the appropriation bill as they have asked for it in their estimate, and we put this \$500,000 in a separate item by itself. We ought certainly to keep that amount in that paragraph. Then if this becomes a law, that, of course, will probably not be used.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. What argument was made before the committee in favor of an additional sum of \$250,000, estimated for in this lump-sum item for further crop estimating? Has not the department large appropriations for that purpose? And what condition is there necessitating the use of this additional large sum for that purpose? Is not that in this item? I thought there was an appropriation of that kind carried in this item.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. This section carries an item of \$234,540 for special work in crop estimate, which, of course, is in addition to the amount appropriated in the regular bill.

Mr. Chairman, I look upon this bill as extravagant. A lot of appropriations here are excessive. I think we ought in war times, when there is such a great demand upon the people all over the country to raise money and purchase bonds, to conserve the money in the Treasury as much as possible. Those of us who know anything about the Fuel Administration know that the Fuel Administration to-day is conserving the fuel supply. Lots of concerns, factories, and industries have had their supply cut off 50 per cent. If the Fuel Administration can do that, it certainly seems right that we should be conservative and cut off all unnecessary items in appropriation bills.

Some of these items are started in a small way. We started last year with a \$25,000 appropriation for one item, and this year they come in and ask for \$135,000 for the same purpose, with an increase of 42 men. It does seem to me that this committee ought to cut down the items to the lowest possible amount. A great many of these items can wait until the war is over. The people at home should not be burdened by raising money for purposes of this kind. This item is administrative. Lots of money can be cut off this bill and saved in the final analysis without interfering seriously with the work of the department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise not so much to speak to this amendment as to make some little reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], who has assaulted the farm-loan act.

Mr. Chairman, at the time that act was passed one of the curses of the Nation was the high rate of interest that prevailed in a great section of the country where farmers were seeking to purchase farms upon which to raise their families. These loans largely were obtainable from life insurance companies and great organizations of capital that made a specialty of making loans on real estate. In my own State, where I think we have some of the richest black land in the world, and it is now selling, much of it, at as high as \$300 per acre, men were forced on that kind of security by these great land-loan concerns and life insurance companies to pay all the way from 8 to 10 and 12 per cent interest. Those were short-term loans, running usually not to exceed five years. The very moment that we passed through this body the farm-loan act that interest rate was cut in half, and now the same concerns that fleeced those people all those years are begging to put their money out at half the rate of interest that they formerly assessed against men who were attempting to buy homes, and are making legitimate loans on this valuable real estate security.

It is true that since this bill became a law we have entered this great war, and the Government has gone into the field in competition for the surplus money of the country in order to win this war. We have given the Government the right of way, and necessarily every kind of business institution in the world has had to get out of the way when the Government demands came, and they should have gotten out of the way. The very fact that this war is on has interfered with the operations of the Farm Loan Board. My own impression is that the farm-loan security under the system that we have is as fine an investment as the Nation affords to-day. But temporarily we must stand aside. We must first win this war. But I do not see how any man can stand on the floor of this Congress and criticize that law when it has served its purpose by cutting down these high interest charges, giving a man 30 or 40 years' time in which to develop and pay for his home. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman from Michigan, to whom the gentleman refers, stated that \$209,000,000 of the Govern-

ment's funds had been diverted to this farm-loan business. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if he has recently examined it, and, if so, if he has not found that only \$57,000,000 have been taken of the farm-loan bonds by the Government and only \$100,000,000 were provided this year, and that, with \$9,000,000 that was taken of stock, makes only \$66,000,000, instead of \$209,000,000 invested in that? Did the gentleman notice that?

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman from South Carolina is entirely in error. Two hundred million dollars has been set aside by the Secretary of the Treasury to be drawn in a given time.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman said \$209,000,000 had been diverted to that. As a matter of fact \$57,000,000 and \$9,000,000 have been diverted, and that is shown by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. It does not matter to me, Mr. Chairman, what the figures are. None of this money is going to be lost. The point is that we have taken out of the hands of the Shylocks the power to charge these high rates of interest, and every dollar of this money will be paid back into the Treasury; our people enabled to buy and pay for their homes and tenancy reduced to a minimum. What greater boon could there be than to have a rural-credit system that thus enables our citizenship to become prosperous and contented home owners? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. TALBOTT having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 5489) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange for lands in private ownership lands formerly embraced in the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. POMERENE, and Mr. SHERMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOOD PRODUCTION.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons that I have urged before, I think these items ought to be segregated. I wish, though, particularly to speak in reply to some things that were said by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. No one is more familiar with legislation relating to agriculture than he, and no one has done more than he to advance agriculture in the last generation as far as originating and presenting legislation and with unusual force and ability securing its enactment. He, therefore, knows better than to speak of these as emergency appropriations. They are no such thing. They are urged during the emergency of war under the claim that they are necessary for war. But this is legislation for particular purposes, and particular amounts are carried, some of them necessary, for these particular purposes. The gentleman says that it will be unwise to limit or direct the Secretary of Agriculture as to the use to be made of these funds because there might be an outbreak, or an emergency might arise, requiring the use of larger sums of money than are carried in these items. He spoke of hog cholera and some other great plagues with which the animals of this country have at times been affected. The annual appropriation bill carries nearly \$450,000 for hog cholera, a large part of it as an insurance fund, for an emergency, because hog cholera is not generally prevalent or seriously threatening the hogs of the country. Five hundred thousand dollars is carried in the regular annual appropriation bill to enable the Department of Agriculture to fight and if possible stamp out a new disease of cotton, \$100,000 only to be used at this time for particular purposes, and \$400,000 carried in the bill as an insurance fund for an emergency if it should arise.

No one knows that better than the gentleman from South Carolina. There is a foot-and-mouth disease that afflicted the cattle of the country recently, and an outbreak is, of course, possible. A million dollars is carried in the annual appropriation bill for that emergency should it arise. The bill provides also that the remainder of a former appropriation of \$2,500,000, the unexpended balance of it, for foot-and-mouth disease, may be available for the fiscal year of 1919. We provide for the emergency, we appropriate an insurance fund, as it is called. No provision of this bill can be defended on any such theory.

The gentleman from South Carolina is mistaken. This bill carries money for particular purposes that the Secretary of Agriculture asks for, some of which were allowed by the Committee on Agriculture and some were not. I insist, as I have insisted before, that there is no possible way by which these activities of the Agricultural Department may be supervised or in any way restricted by Congress unless these appropriations are itemized. I am surprised that gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have invariably voted against amendments, because they are in line with demands made by them year after year, whenever appropriation bills have come before the House that they should be itemized.

We are charged with playing politics, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], who is here a part of the time, but away, as he says, making liberty speeches in sections of the country where it is necessary to stir up the people to do their duty during the war, occasionally coming back here and lecturing the House and telling us we are playing politics. If there is anything except politics that has prompted the gentlemen on the other side to stand against these amendments, which many of them must know are right, I do not know what it is. It seems to me that they should vote for some of these things that in private they must concede are right. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations provided for in this paragraph are miscellaneous expenses for the office of the Secretary himself. They are under his personal supervision, for which he is absolutely responsible, and certainly, it seems to me, if there is any appropriation for which all the Members would be willing to vote it would be appropriations to be placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture for the administration of the affairs in his own office. If you can not give him discretion in reference to that, for what could you give him discretion?

That is all there is in the consideration of this item. The gentleman from New Jersey, as usual, as he has in reference to other paragraphs in the bill, moved to itemize it, so that the Secretary in his office, in the miscellaneous expenses connected with his office, the salaries connected with his immediate supervision, is told that he must not spend any money for this or that, only so much and not a dollar more. I presume it may get to the point where we will be asked to prescribe that the Secretary may spend a dollar and a half, but can not spend a dollar and six bits. It is only another effort to segregate the items and take the discretion away from the Secretary of Agriculture. While there might have been some justification, although I have not seen it, for dividing up and segregating other items, certainly there is no justification for segregating the items for the administration of the Secretary's own office and payment of salaries under his immediate direction. I can state, without any criticism, that when the committee reached the consideration of this item, be it said to their credit and good judgment, everybody said that is for the Secretary's office, we have no objection to it; let us consider something else, which we did. It is proposed now to divide it up and take another view in reference to it. Therefore I ask that the amendment be voted down. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUTCHINSON) there were—ayes 21, noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 22, strike out the figures "\$1,105,980" and insert "\$905,980."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, when the food-survey bill, or the act of August 10, 1917, was passed it carried an appropriation of \$650,000 for this particular item now under consideration. The testimony in the hearings shows that \$234,800 of the \$650,000 was used for the purpose of publishing and distributing emergency leaflets, posters, and other publications. In the statement of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Clarence Owsley, made to the committee, he says that it is the purpose of the department to use \$235,000 next year in the publication and distribution of these emergency leaflets, posters, and publications. The inquiry naturally arises, What is the nature of these emergency leaflets, posters, and publications? And Mr. Owsley explains that in his testimony on page 172 of the hearings. He says:

I may say that the character of the publications under the emergency or food-production act differs from the regular publications only in the respect that the emergency publications are addressed to the particular needs of the moment, and we do not use that fund for any of the regular publications.

In other words, the emergency leaflets and posters are of the same nature as the ordinary farm bulletins that are distributed from the Department of Agriculture, except, as Mr. Owsley says, they are addressed to the particular needs of the moment. I have no criticism whatever to make of the distribution of farm bulletins or of the Department of Agriculture in its important work. I have assisted as best I could in their general and practical distribution in my own district. I have always found the available supply quite ample to fill all the demands I have had for these bulletins, and certainly no additional appropriation for that kind of work is needed, other than the regular appropriation which is carried in the sundry civil bill. I do not think my experience in this particular matter is any different from that of other Members, and I believe that you will agree that it is our general experience. Again, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Owsley, states, in referring to the regular fund for printing bulletins, that probably all of it would not be expended. He assigns the reason as follows:

Mr. Chairman, on account of the congestion in the Government Printing Office, we will perhaps not use all of the required fund.

When we observe the tons and tons of printed matter constantly pouring out of Washington, some of it good and some not so good, it is no wonder to us that there is congestion in the Government Printing Office. The wonder is that it is able to keep up at all. It is also no mystery to us that the cost of white paper is so high. How are these emergency publications distributed? What is the method? Mr. Owsley tells us in his statement in the hearings:

They are distributed mainly through our county agents that now are found in nearly every agricultural community in the United States. Then we use the councils of defense for this purpose.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to state that already the councils of defense for the different States have come before Congress and asked that we give them the franking privilege in the use of the mails. It so happens that I am the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads that has under consideration a bill at this very time along the lines I have just mentioned. It was introduced by Mr. McKEOWN, of Oklahoma, and provides that the franking privilege shall be granted to the chairmen of the State councils of defense as well as the county chairmen. And I submit in all good conscience, if we continue to call upon them to distribute quantities of such matter as has been sent them by the various departments of the Federal Government we ought to grant them the franking privilege. We ought not to expect them to distribute it at their own cost and expense. I have a letter here which I have just recently received from one of the most alert and active of these State chairmen. I am not going to quote his name, because perhaps it would not be proper to do that in the absence of his permission, but he incloses me a copy of a letter which he recently wrote to the Council of National Defense, and I want to read a portion of it to you. I will state that he lives in a near-by Democratic State, is a very patriotic worker, and is not in any sense a critic of our administration. But he is calling attention to a condition which we know exists and ought at least to be corrected to some extent. He says:

For a year now we have been engaged assiduously in organizing the Nation for war, and we have laid great stress upon coordination, correlation, efficiency, and the elimination of nonessentials, and yet in spite of all this well-directed effort there is much useless waste in man power and resources in the unnecessary volume of printed matter sent out from Washington to newspapers and numerous war activities. While in the main the stuff is all good, yet the newspaper offices are so gorged with this volume that they can not spare the time to read it or even brief it or publish remote parts of it, and the result is that very little of it is printed. As to the various activities I can only imagine they are in the same condition as we are and that they complain about it. That is, we receive an enormous volume of this matter, that we can only glance at the headlines and throw it aside. Very little of it is available, for the reason that we can not spare the man power and the money necessary to assimilate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK (continuing the reading):—

There is a cry made that this multiplicity of communications be simplified and reduced in volume. The duplication can not be entirely eliminated, but it can be wonderfully improved, and it is my earnest hope that the State council section will take hold of this, with a view of supervising the system of emanation and distribution, and as far as possible control and make available a large source of information that is now going to waste.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the gentleman also noted that some of the congestion in the mail is being caused by the practice of

many gentlemen who are temporarily serving on liberty bond committees, and so forth, sending out under frank of the Treasury Department speeches they have made on the war and all sorts of literature which they seem to think important?

Mr. BLACK. Well, those things have not come under my observation.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have seen a number of those instances.

Mr. BLACK. Well, to say the least of it, a great deal of this literature could be simplified and curtailed to great advantage. But, in further argument in support of my amendment, I submit that the statement of Mr. Owsley himself shows that this \$235,000 is to be used for the publication of pamphlets and leaflets substantially the same as our ordinary Farmers' Bulletins. As I have heretofore pointed out, the sundry civil bill carries an ample appropriation for that purpose, and I think this is one of the places where we can use some sensible and proper economy and save unnecessary duplication. Now, the amendment I have offered will still leave \$35,000 that the Secretary may use in case of a real emergency, and I believe that that is all that will be needed in view of the ample and sufficient regular appropriation for farm bulletins, carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill. I put the question squarely to you, gentlemen of the House, Shall we put forward any effort to check this waste of printed matter that has been called to our attention and is being called to our attention day by day? What are we to do about it? Are we going to shut our eyes and tell the various departments of the Government to "Go to it; Congress will vote the money." And then when we observe what we think is unnecessary matter going out, shall we stand here on the floor of the House and criticize them for doing what we have authorized by law to be done? The thing to do is to scrutinize these appropriations when the bills are before us and eliminate those items which we think are unnecessary and improper and appropriate only the money that we think is necessary for the purpose to be effected and then the cause for criticism will not arise. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 22, strike out "\$1,105,980" and insert "\$705,980."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] has made an argument that ought to be convincing and conclusive to the House with regard to the reduction of this estimate by \$200,000. No one in this House appreciates more the value of the farm bulletins and other publications of the Agricultural Department than I. No one makes a larger use of them than I, but, as the gentleman has well said, we are already getting a sufficient supply of those valuable documents, and in these days when the price of print paper is mounting higher every day and the Government Printing Office is taxed beyond its capacity in printing articles necessary for the carrying on of the war, we ought not to make these additional unnecessary appropriations. Now, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas proposes to reduce the appropriation \$200,000. I propose to reduce it \$200,000 more or \$400,000 in all, so as to provide for the reduction he proposes and also to reduce by \$200,000 one of the items of expenditure contemplated under this appropriation, the item of special work in crop estimates. Why, the members of the committee and the best informed members of the committee were so little informed as to the necessity of the expenditure of this additional sum for special crop estimating, that when I asked so well informed a member of the committee as the gentleman from New Jersey his views about it a moment ago, he had forgotten for the moment that there was any such expenditure contemplated under this item. The gentleman from Minnesota informs me that the item for the regular crop estimate in the pending appropriation bill is \$346,000, but there are other items carried in the bill which are used indirectly for the purpose of crop estimates. Now, I know of no condition at this time that warrants the expenditure of an additional \$234,000 as contemplated under this item for that purpose. I propose to reduce the \$234,000 to \$34,000, leaving that sum that can be used for special estimating, which added to the sum carried in the regular appropriation bill will make the sum available for this particular purpose about \$380,000, nearly \$400,000, in addition to the other sums carried in the bill which can be used directly or indirectly for that purpose. Now, these days, when we are asking the people to economize, when we are asking them to reduce the consumption of provisions of all kinds, when we are taxing

them heavily, and when we are asking them to buy liberty bonds to and beyond their capacity, is no time for a useless and unnecessary expenditure even under so worthy a department as the Department of Agriculture. We are hoping to have a larger crop than ordinary this year, but it does not require a doubling of appropriations to estimate a larger than an ordinary crop.

A large crop can be estimated very nearly as cheaply as a small crop. As a matter of fact it may be easier and cheaper to estimate a large than a small crop, because that means in the main your production is well up to the maximum. Now, I would not cut out a dollar of this appropriation which is really necessary and essential, and I have inquired of members of the committee as to whether or not they were impressed with the necessity of these additional sums. I found none of them had been so impressed, but that they felt as the department had asked for it they, out of abundance of caution and liberality, should perhaps grant them these sums. We can not afford to legislate in that way. We can not afford to legislate in that way particularly in these days when we are trying to keep down unnecessary expenditures in order that we may have funds available for those expenditures that are absolutely necessary and essential. I trust that the committee will accept my amendment, which includes the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted, either the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming or the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. The reduction which the amendment proposes to make as offered by the gentleman from Texas is for literature that is sent out directly from the office and under the supervision of the office of the Secretary of Agriculture himself. It is not farm bulletins, it is an entirely different class of literature intended to reach a different class of people and intended to accomplish a different purpose entirely.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the gentleman seen any of them which he thinks are half as valuable as the farm bulletins? Most of them are entirely uninteresting and without value. I think they are publications of the various bureaus, of little value, and not to be classed at all with the farm bulletins, which are of great value.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The farm bulletins are very valuable, and there is a great demand for them throughout the country. I have requests for them daily. These are temporary emergency publications and are published at the time under the direction of the Secretary to accentuate conditions and stir up interest in a community or in a section of the country where it may be necessary to attract specific attention to some immediate necessity.

Now, that is the object and the purpose of these publications, and they are sent out under the direction of the Secretary himself. Now, I do not believe that the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] ought to be adopted, for the reason that the purpose of this bill is to increase the crop of foodstuffs, and these estimates become more valuable now than at other times, when no such condition exists. There is a great difference between conditions in the country at the present time, when things are to be done quickly and information has to be obtained in the most expeditious manner, than in normal times. Therefore, it is proposed, as I stated a while ago, to have the work which is being done and which will be done under the direction and immediate supervision of the Secretary himself, and I do not believe any activities which he directs himself and which he feels necessary for his department should be limited, especially when they are administered directly under his own supervision. [Applause.]

I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MONDELL. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 27, yeas 34.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now recurs on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 22, yeas 25.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin sends an amendment to the desk, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 4, line 5, after the word "Columbia," strike out the remainder of the sentence and insert: "occupied by any bureau, division, or any branch of the Department of Agriculture."

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. May I ask the gentleman a question before he begins? Does this limit the commandeering section to the Agricultural Department?

Mr. STAFFORD. It limits the authority of the Department of Agriculture to commandeer only those premises which are now in the occupation of any bureau, division, or other branch of the department.

Mr. RUBEY. You give them the right to commandeer a dwelling?

Mr. STAFFORD. Now occupied by the Department of Agriculture for any of its activities.

Mr. RUBEY. This amendment excepts any house occupied as a dwelling?

Mr. STAFFORD. But the Agricultural Department to-day is in possession, in the work of the department, of some dwellings. The provision recommended by the committee would grant them authority to commandeer any space anywhere in the District except dwelling houses now occupied for dwelling purposes, or other buildings when occupied by some other branch of the Government.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It especially excepts those.

Mr. STAFFORD. I stated that.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The purpose of the Committee on Agriculture in putting this section in the bill was to reach a certain building, which is a building down here on F Street, occupied by the Forest Service, for which the Government has been paying \$18,000 annually. Now, the lease is about to expire, and on addressing a note to the people who own this building they made a curt reply that they did not care about the Government having it at all, but if they wanted it they could have it at an annual rental of \$34,000. We thought we ought to have some right to say to those people that they could not profiteer in war times.

Mr. STAFFORD. The amendment I propose would reach that case, but it would not confer the blanket authority to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to go throughout the city and commandeer any office space he saw fit when not used by any other branch of the Government. I will ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] whether he can inform the committee as to how much money in the case instanced by him is paid by the owners for light, heat, and other purposes?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I have no figures at hand. All I know is that they have been satisfied with \$18,000 a year, and not a dollar of improvement has been made on the building and there is not a foot more of space taken, and yet they put it up from \$18,000 to \$34,000 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. If I may proceed to explain my position, I wish to say that the legislative subcommittee has jurisdiction, virtually, of the rental of buildings in the District used by the Government, except of those used by the Agricultural Department. Our committee has been confronted with the very problem with which the Committee on Agriculture has been confronted. There are instances where the owners have with good reason demanded an increase of rental. There are many instances that have been called to our attention where the department, perhaps, should have had the authority to commandeer buildings generally; but we have not given nor have the heads of the other departments requested our committee to give this authority to the heads of the departments, or even to the President, to commandeer buildings for these purposes. Take, for instance, the case of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, which has grown so rapidly since its creation last October. Part of their clerks are housed in the New National Museum Building, a part in the Convention Hall, and in the armory and in the old Elks' building, and yet the Secretary of the Treasury did not come to us for authority to go into the District and commandeer expensive office space that is now used by private persons. If we grant the authority to commandeer this office space we will have to pay a reasonable price for it. It will not be the price as fixed by the heads of the departments. It will be the price as fixed by the courts; and under this provision they will be paid 75 per cent forthwith of that which is determined by the head of the department, and the balance they can go into court and collect. I question whether we should even go to the extent that we are going here, to grant to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to commandeer buildings now occupied, as is proposed by my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Just for a question. I want to proceed with my argument.

Mr. RUBEY. Suppose the present building occupied by the Department of Agriculture, a very large building, should be destroyed by fire, and it should be necessary for the department to get another building. If we did not adopt an amendment, would not the department be at the mercy of somebody?

Mr. STAFFORD. Even in that exigency I do not think we should grant this authority without limit to any department. We should not authorize the department to go and select quarters in these expensive office buildings.

Mr. RUBEY. This amendment would prevent the department from doing that.

Mr. STAFFORD. It would prevent the department from doing that, but it would permit the Department of Agriculture to commandeer for continued use these premises that are now occupied by the department. As I understood the purpose of the committee provision, it was to cover the case instanced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young], referring to the Atlantic Building, where the rental to-day is \$18,000, and where the owners contribute \$9,000 of expense for heating and lighting and other service, and where they propose to charge \$34,000 and make the price 55 cents per square foot rental. I do not propose to argue that case, and yet 55 cents per square foot rental, from my knowledge of this question obtained in the Committee on Appropriations, is not an exorbitant figure. The Department of Agriculture here is paying as high as \$1.13. Take the Munsey Building, for instance. Of course the rate will be greater for the Munsey Building because of the location. This Atlantic Building is in a quarter where there is demand for space for commercial purposes, but there are other buildings where the location is not as good, and yet in such locations the Agricultural Department is paying as high as 86 cents per square foot, without any allowance for light or heat.

But I want to state that it is not wise for the committee to grant this blanket authority to the department to go into the District and commandeer office space. If they want to reach and effect the purpose stated let them adopt my amendment and allow the department to remain in possession of its present quarters, and if they can not arrive at satisfactory terms of rental, then they will submit their proposal to the owner and allow the owner to accept 75 per cent of it, and have the owner go into court for the other 25 per cent and such additional amount, if any, as the court determines to be a reasonable amount.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Suppose the department needs the space and must have it, but can not get it. Then what would you do?

Mr. STAFFORD. There are cases of that kind in the experience of the State Department and the Treasury Department. But the Department of Agriculture is not engaged to any extent in war activities. We have thrown additional activities on the Treasury Department in the creation of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau and the additional income and excess-profits taxes. They have gone ahead and met those conditions, and met them wisely, by taking all the available space of buildings which could be found—the Convention Hall, the National Museum, and the armory over Center Market, and the Elks' building; so that we should not, I respectfully contend, grant this power to commandeer.

There is no pressing reason why you should grant this great authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to go and take space wherever he wants it. We know the common tendency of bureaus. They want to be housed in as good a place as can be found. The Department of Agriculture is not pressed in its war activities as some of the other departments are.

Those buildings used by the department are mostly fireproof buildings. It is a case that is difficult to conceive of. I believe that this amendment should be adopted, so as to protect the Government and provide necessary space for the Department of Agriculture in case it is held up outrageously by any landlord, and still not give the department such great authority that it can go and take places anywhere and say they are necessary for the department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes—5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] and 5 to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto shall close in 10 minutes, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] to have 5 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi to have 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the commandeering feature ought to be retained in the bill. I am not sure that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin ought not to meet the approval of the committee. That still retains the commandeering idea in the bill to a certain extent. I want to call the attention of the committee for a few minutes to the abnormal price of everything, which is expressed also by this exorbitant requirement in the form of rents. I do not think for a moment that the proprietor who demands the increased rental is justified; but there is one side of this question that the Government in a degree is probably responsible for. It might be that it can not help it, that the advance in the current price of everything is inevitable, incident to the war. However that may be, the increase in the price of everything with which the Government deals is very noticeable. It is pertinent to ask whether it is necessary.

When I called attention to the high prices paid for material and for labor in connection with the aviation fields and the numerous cantonments, especially those with which I had acquaintance, at first the fact was disputed, and when the evidence was produced it was admitted. But the explanation was offered that the Government could not do otherwise; that it had to have the labor and the material at whatever price demanded. It was observed that we took the labor from a permanent employment and placed it in this temporary employment, and consequently before acceptance it necessarily would demand a very high wage. This scale of prices is very noticeable in the Capital. The Government is doing more, undoubtedly, in the city of Washington than in any other city in the country. It is therefore making Washington more or less a barometer of expense by giving expression to the rate of outlay, which will naturally reflect itself in the price of rentals, in the price of everything we have to pay for as our necessities here in the District.

Here are a few figures that are illuminating. A gentleman writes me to-day. He is a builder:

A carpenter recently working for me at \$5 a day worked last week on a Government building at Sixth and B Streets, and drew \$104 for the week's labor, including overtime. An electrician who formerly worked for me recently drew \$120 for one week's pay on a Government building.

Many laborers not trained mechanics have been taken from my force and put to work on Government buildings under the guise of carpenters; they are put to work doing common labor, and with allowance of time and a half and double time frequently draw \$75 and \$90 per week.

Material and labor have gone up over 100 per cent on all of the above. Carpenters who two years ago were paid \$3.50 now get \$5 and \$6; painters two years ago who were paid \$3 now get \$5 and \$6; laborers who were formerly paid \$1.50 per day now get \$3.50 to \$4 per day.

What I desire the committee to note is the comparative price the Government pays. In this time under the claims of imperative necessity the Government attracts all the labor available at fabulous prices, and on the cost-plus plan makes the highest cost rather than the lowest the chief item of the contract. We hear it said that companies which have been utilized by the Government on the cost-plus plan have at once increased their managerial charge, including overhead, as much as 100 per cent.

These charges are made frequently and ought to be items of investigation. Be these statements true or false, the Government is certainly an extravagant employer in war times. The facts here revealed show what part of the responsibility the Government must shoulder for the exorbitant expense in Washington.

This letter also proceeds to give the increase in the rates of insurance and various exactions for the men who own the property. I do not excuse property holders here, I condemn them for what they demand. I rose simply to call attention to this phase of it, that while these prices are abnormal—and it is claimed as inevitable—it might be that we can not avoid it. However, I assert that the Government is very largely responsible for establishing this large increase on the basis that it proceeds according to the theory that we must pay any price that anybody should demand. If the outlay is high, then the whole price current will be high. We are not ready to conscript

labor, we do not enlist it by law, and therefore when employers are making great profits most naturally labor becomes persistent, and if they ask these enormous prices like \$104 a week, and the Government pays them, everything else found in the market as a mere matter of sympathy goes up in accordance, and therefore it is not all on one side. While the landowner here is in part to blame, the Government must take its share also. I am in favor of the commandeering feature as a protection to the Government, even if it is in great part to blame. I insist there are two sides to the question. In so doing I do not exculpate the guilty. The truth about the matter is, in this time of stress, when we all wish to be patriotic to the last demand, we are too prone to attempt to make hay while the sun shines—to get all we can while the getting is good.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, if adopted, would confine the Government in commandeering property to that which they now already occupy, and would not permit the Government to vacate any property they now occupy and go out in the city anywhere and secure other property.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This commandeering proposition was put in the bill for the purpose of meeting a situation existing on F Street at the present time, where the Forestry Service is now located. The Government for some years has been paying \$18,000 a year for what is known as the Atlantic Building. The lease expires on the 30th day of June, and the owners of the building, or those in control of it, have notified the Agricultural Department that unless they pay \$34,000 a year, which is an increase of \$16,000, or 87 per cent, they must get out and go somewhere else. This provision, therefore, was put into the bill for the purpose of meeting that situation, so as to not permit these people to demand of the Government this exorbitant rent.

The objection that I have to the proposition of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is that if, by his provision, he confines the department to the building already occupied by the Government, of course that would confine the department absolutely to the commandeering of this one building. It might be possible before the time arrives that a better building might be found which could be obtained at a reasonable rental, and, if not, that could be commandeered, which would answer the purpose of the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the blanket authority contained in the provision as reported by the committee, would not the Agriculture Department have the right to go down and commandeer the entire Munsey Building?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Oh, yes. They could go wherever they wanted to, but the Department of Agriculture would not do that, as evidenced by their record heretofore. I had occasion last year and the year before to give a list of the rentals paid by the Department of Agriculture, and they were paying less per square foot than any department of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman aware that the department has occupied space, and is to-day occupying space, in the Munsey Building?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I know that it has in time past.

Mr. STAFFORD. And is at present.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. By some division of the Bureau of Markets.

Mr. STAFFORD. And paying \$1.35 a square foot.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. And occupying just as little space as possible. The department would be glad to get out to-morrow if they could get accommodations elsewhere. The rentals paid by the Department of Agriculture, on the average, are less per square foot than any of the departments of the Government.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Perhaps it has not been called to the attention of the House that this bill limits the right of the Secretary of Agriculture to pay rent for property which is now occupied by the department, or which may be commandeered later by the department, to the amount of money carried in the bill and the regular annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for rent.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for that suggestion. I had intended to call the attention of the House to that fact. The Secretary is confined to the appropriation, and he could not go out and commandeer extravagant property, and, as shown by the record of the department, would have no inclination to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 16, noes 42.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. MADDEN. We will take the vote on this to-morrow.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, no; the vote has been taken.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Will not this vote be taken when we meet again?

Mr. GARNER. The amendment has been defeated.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. And the vote was announced.

Mr. MADDEN. But I was on my feet making the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it the gentleman's intention to make the point of order with a view to having the vote taken when we meet again?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Then I withdraw my motion to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MADDEN (interrupting the count). I withdraw the point of order, so far as the question of the vote is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote on this amendment is—ayes 16, noes 42, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11945 and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3911. An act authorizing national banks to subscribe to the American National Red Cross.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 8696. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919; and

H. R. 11628. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia," approved September 25, 1914.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MOORES of Indiana was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of the correction of the military record of James Andy Wallace, H. R. 18427, Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse report having been filed thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 22, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the director of purchase, storage, and traffic, United States Army, for salaries of employees of his office for the balance of the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1115), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HELM, from the Committee on the Census, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, reported the same without

amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 581), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAGSDALE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6955) to provide for the abandonment of Piney Branch Road between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 584), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) extending the provisions of act of Congress approved December 20, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize absence by homestead settlers and entrymen, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 586), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONTAGUE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6979) to regulate the personnel of the Coast Guard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 587), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHALEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 70) providing for an additional judge for the district of Montana, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 590), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3786) for the relief of C. R. Shaw, Allen Shaw, and Robert Shaw, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 580), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MERRITT, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4458) for the relief of Frank H. Walker and Frank E. Smith, a part of whose real property was taken and is now occupied by the United States for the foundation of the west wall of the Government Printing Office, in the city of Washington, and the remainder not taken damaged by reason of the construction and operation of said Printing Office, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 582), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLEMORE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12122) for the relief of Ella Oliver Richardson and Edmund Richardson, of New Orleans, La., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 583), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McCLINTIC, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 585), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WELLING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 914) for the relief of William Wooster, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 588), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of Eugene Fazzi, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 589), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 12209) to amend the war-risk insurance act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 12210) to amend the act of May 14, 1898, as amended by the act of March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to extend the homestead laws and regulate the sale and entry of public lands along the shores of navigable waters in Alaska"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 12212) to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolution (H. Res. 355) authorizing a clerk to the Special Committee on Water Power; to the Committee on Accounts.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging upon Congress the repeal or suspension of the zone system for postage of second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging upon Congress the repeal or suspension of the zone system for postage of second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, urging upon Congress the repeal or suspension of the zone system of postage for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MCCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 12213) to reimburse H. O. Sparks, postmaster at Boaz, Ala., for money misappropriated by some one connected with the post office at that place before Sparks became postmaster and repaid by him to the Post Office Department.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12214) granting an increase of pension to Fayette G. Hubbard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 12215) granting an increase of pension to William A. McGinety; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 12216) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah McAllister Madden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 12217) granting a pension to George E. Wade; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12218) granting an increase of pension to William Goolman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 12219) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12220) granting a pension to Isaac Slygh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 12221) granting an increase of pension to David S. Rimmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12222) for the relief of David J. Alley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 12223) granting a pension to Emma A. Rowland; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the Washington Chamber of Commerce, urging the immediate installation of a municipal ferry between East Potomac Park and the foot of Seventh Street; also a resolution of the Washington Chamber of Commerce relative to proportion of District of Columbia expenses to be paid by Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), resolution of the Washington Chamber of Commerce, relative to the adoption of a program that will insure adequate highway construction and maintenance; to the Committee on Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Arthur Burrage Farwell, president Chicago Law and Order League and of the members of the Y. M. C. A. of Central Wesleyan College, Warrenton, Mo., urging

the passage of the war prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the Silver Laundry Co., Kansas City, Mo., and of the Wesco Supply Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the repeal of the periodical postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of Milwaukee (Wis.) Association of Life Underwriters, favoring Senate joint resolution 63; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEA of California: Telegram from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Orland, Cal., requesting the passage of the bill providing for absolute prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of John F. Sippel, Catonsville, Md., protesting against the amendment to the naval appropriation bill which would eliminate efficiency tests; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Federal Employees' Union No. 21, urging the defeat of the Borland amendment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Floyd T. Holden, Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 11710; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Henry A. Brehm, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Flood enabling act for the migratory-bird treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 101, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, urging the passage of the bill by Mr. MORT relative to free transportation of enlisted men on furlough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Printing Pressmen's Union No. 51, of the Baltimore Photo Engravers Union, and of the Cigar Makers Union No. 1, Baltimore, Md., favoring the repeal of the zone system as applied to second-class postage rates; also the petition of the Automobile Accessories Co., Baltimore, Md., protesting against the repeal of periodical postage provisions of the war-revenue act; also the petition of Stuart, Keith & Co., Baltimore, Md., favoring partial payments of income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of President Marion Leroy Burton, E. P. Lyon, John R. Allen, Ed. Nicholson, W. R. Vance, J. B. Johnson, Inter-Collegiate Prohibition Association, favoring the prohibition of the manufacture or sale of liquor during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Grand Chapter, Order of the Eastern Star, Minneapolis, Minn., through Mary E. Taylor, grand secretary, favoring all legislation prohibiting use of food supplies for other than food purposes, and urging the immediate closing of all breweries and saloons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Retail Druggists of Minneapolis, Minn., through Charles H. Huhn, asking that manufacturers of drugs and medicines be placed on the preferential list to receive coal and coke; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Minneapolis Retail Credit Association, Mr. Carlton Fish, secretary, favoring Senate bill 1000; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of United Spanish-American Veterans, Bond Camp, Minneapolis, Minn., through William H. Gerlach, asking that the Spanish War veterans' widows and orphans pension be added to the Sherwood bill granting pensions to veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa, protesting against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Sunday School of the Methodist Church of Nunda, N. Y., favoring the prohibition of the beverage liquor traffic during the period of the war as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of H. R. Howes & Son, of Wyoming, N. Y., urging the immediate passage of a national war-prohibition measure to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of all intoxicating liquor in this country during the period of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Medical Society of the county of Livingston, N. Y., indorsing the Owen bill (S. 3748) and the Dyer bill (H. R. 9563); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 15 residents of Middleport and Medina, N. Y., urging the repeal of the zone system for second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pike, N. Y., urging the repeal of the zone system for second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pike, N. Y., protesting against the bill to direct the Secretary

of War to donate ground on which to erect a monument to nuns in the Arlington Cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pike, N. Y., protesting against House bill 5712; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of citizens of Wood County, W. Va., asking for the repeal of the recently enacted "zone" postal law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 22, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, it is our will to do Thy will. We have inherited high and holy principles from our fathers, and we desire to keep inviolate that which has been intrusted to us out of their achievements in the past. We desire to face the new day with courage, with faith, with confidence. We pray Thee to lead us on in the discharge of our duties to accomplish all of God's perfect will in the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. OWEN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 3911) authorizing national banks to subscribe to the American National Red Cross, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STERLING. I have here resolutions passed by the South Dakota Sunday School Convention held at Watertown, S. Dak., May 14, 15, and 16. The resolutions relate to a proposed State constitutional amendment and also to the Federal suffrage amendment now pending. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the State legislature at its recent session submitted amendment "E," which reads as follows:

"Every person resident of this State who shall be of the age of 21 years and upward, not otherwise disqualified, belonging to either of the following classes, who shall have resided in the United States 5 years, in this State 1 year, in the county 90 days, and in the election precinct where such person offers his vote 30 days next preceding any election shall be qualified elector at such election.

"First. Citizens of the United States.

"Second. Persons of foreign birth who have become naturalized citizens in conformity to the laws of the United States upon the subject of naturalization": Therefore be it

Resolved, That in recognition of the splendid lives and noble work of the women of our State we urge the voters of South Dakota to give them full citizenship by voting for this amendment.

Whereas the Federal suffrage amendment has passed the National House of Representatives, we therefore ask the Senate to bring it up for immediate and favorable action; and we request our secretary to send a copy of this paragraph to the President of the Senate and to our Senators from South Dakota.

Mr. BORAH. I ask leave to present a telegram in the form of a petition and have it referred to the appropriate committee.

The telegram was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALDWELL, IDAHO, May 21.

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH,
Washington, D. C.:

The price of wheat being fixed at shipping point the price of cereal substitutes are regarded in a fair ratio with the price of wheat. And price of farm implements be regulated during period of the war recommendations unanimously adopted to-day at meeting of executive committee Canyon County Farm Bureau. Kindly present to House Committee on Agriculture.

C. B. ROSS, President.
AMOS J. MILLER, Secretary.
R. P. MUSSER, County Agricultural Agent.

Mr. CURTIS presented a petition of the Kansas State Osteopathic Association, praying for recognition by Congress of the science of osteopathy, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Central Labor Union, of Coffeyville, Kans., and resolutions adopted by the executive board of the Kansas State Federation of Labor, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the reeducation and rehabilitation of crippled soldiers and sailors, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina presented a petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Bennettsville, S. C., praying for the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates on second-class mail matter, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented resolutions adopted by the National Association of Specialty Advertising Manufacturers, of the State of Minnesota, relative to the distinction between commercial bribery and specialty advertising, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the Anti-Saloon League, of Le Sueur Center, Minn.; of the Congregation of the First Baptist Church, of Kasson; and of sundry citizens of Kasson and Barnum, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

WAR FILMS.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, a day or two since I presented a telegram from the governor of Michigan relative to certain war films. I then stated that when I heard from the chief of the bureau I would submit his reply. I called up Mr. Hart, of the Bureau of Films, over the phone the next morning, and he assured me that there was some misunderstanding which he would have corrected. I desire now to send to the desk and have read his telegram.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

NEW YORK, May 17, 1918.

Senator CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
Washington, D. C.:

Confirming telephone conversation to-day, will write you a letter after my return from conference with Gov. Sleeper and Mr. Duff detailing entire situation. Thank you for your courtesy in matter, and I assure you that equitable arrangements will be made which will be satisfactory to all concerned. I greatly appreciate your kindness in volunteering to read my letter in the Senate.

CHAS. S. HART,

Director Division of Films Committee on Public Information.

Mr. TOWNSEND. On the same day I received a telegram from the governor of Michigan, which I also ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

LANSING, MICH., May 19, 1918.

Hon. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Film matter amicably and satisfactorily adjusted yesterday at Chicago between Mr. Hart and Mr. Duff. Division of films lives up to its agreement by giving War Board sole and exclusive picture rights outside of city of Detroit. This is perfectly agreeable to us.

ALBERT E. SLEEPER, Governor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GRONNA, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 641) for the relief of Mary C. Mayers, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 453) thereon.

Mr. NEW, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3258) for the relief of Ethel Proctor, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 455) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3944) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 454) thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11185) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 457) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2088) to consolidate certain forest lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, and to add certain lands thereto, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 456) thereon.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Pensions I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 9959) increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, together with a report (No. 452) thereon.

I simply wish to make a brief statement as to the bill. The bill reported is the House bill commonly known as the Sherwood bill. The Committee on Pensions has stricken out all after the enacting clause and inserted the provisions of Senate bill 3783, known as the Smoot bill, Order of Business 230 on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ELIZABETH MARSH WATKINS.

Mr. GRONNA. From the Committee on Claims I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2896) for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins, and I submit a report (No.